


Ernst Henry

# What Are They After in Peking

Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated from the Russian by *David Fidlon*

Designed by *Vladimir Yurchikov*

Эрнст Генри

ЧЕГО ХОТЯТ В ПЕКИНЕ?

*На английском языке*

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1979

English translation © Progress Publishers 1979

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

Г $\frac{10303—949}{014(01)—79}$ 40—79

0302030900

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CONTENTS

Foreword to the English edition 5
1. It Is the Living Who Need Communism 13
2. A Glance from the Pamirs 21
3. Pondering the Future 35
4. Revanchists and Maoists 42
5. A Reply to a Maoist and a Reply to a Revanchist 57
6. Betrayal 62
7. Maoism and Chinese History 72
8. Backstage Manoeuvres 80
9. The "Great Man" 103
10. Mao's Long-Term Plan 113
11. Greatness or Barbarity 136
12. Against Lies in World Politics 159
13. The True Face of Mao Tse-tung 169
14. What Was Trettner Doing in Peking? 177
15. In Lieu of an Epilogue 189

## FOREWORD TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

The articles in this volume were written over a span of several years beginning with 1967 when, like many other Soviet people, I began seriously to reflect upon Maoism, and ending with the years when the repercussions of the so-called cultural revolution were still being felt in the PRC. Hence they were all written prior to Mao Tse-tung's death.

But is this book outdated simply because the "great helmsman" has departed this world and his closest associates with his wife at the head are under arrest, expelled from the Party for good and possibly awaiting trial?

Having asked myself this question I attentively reread these articles and decided that the thoughts and appraisals they contain are as topical as ever.

Mao Tse-tung is no more, but Maoism has not changed. China's policy today is basically the same as Mao Tse-tung's policy of the sixties and the first half of the seventies. Certain changes are taking place only in its phraseology and even those are not too significant, in the schedules of its planned operations, in its tactics and economic calculations and in the composition of the Chinese leadership. Basically, it has remained unchanged. And China under the leadership of Hua Kuo-feng, Teng Hsiao-ping, Li Hsien-nien, Yeh Chien-ying and Wang Tung-hsing continues to follow the road indicated by Mao Tse-tung.

Moreover, the present Peking leaders, who are called pragmatists in the West as their mentor Chou En-lai was called there, appear to be less fanatical, more sensible

and efficient than their forerunners in the eyes of some Western observers. But is that the case?

I know that in Britain and other Western countries there are different attitudes to modern China. It would be useless to argue with those sharing the view of Chief of the UK Defence Staff General Neil Cameron who has called Moscow a common enemy standing at the gates of China and Britain. Nor will I argue with Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, leader of the Conservative Party, who insists that Cameron is right. But as regards the British readers who have not formed a definite opinion so far, it is another matter. I would like to draw their attention to the following issues.

First of all I would like to ask them the question that now interests millions of Soviet people and which is permanently on the pages of the world press. Why does Peking continue to refuse, and in a deliberately arrogant manner at that, to normalise relations with the USSR, something which Moscow has been offering for years?

It is common knowledge that the USSR has absolutely no territorial claims to China, and that it has issued numerous official statements to this effect. But what are the aims of the Chinese leaders? In order to answer this question let us refer to documents.

In August 1964 Mao Tse-tung told a group of Japanese socialist deputies that Khabarovsk, Vladivostok and Kamchatka became Russian territory "a mere one hundred years ago", and added: "We have not yet presented a bill on this score."

A glance at the map will tell us what he was after, and quite obviously Mao Tse-tung's heirs are up to the same thing: not only to annex the Soviet Far East along the coast of the Sea of Japan, but also to break through across Siberia far to the north up to the Bering Sea. It will be remembered that not so long ago similar plans were harboured by Japanese militarists.

Is it surprising, therefore, that the Soviet people are indignant with the Maoist policy? Such are the intentions of those whom the USSR has always regarded as its true friends.



It should not be forgotten that it was the Soviet Union which routed Japan's Kwantung Army in August 1945, thus making it possible for China to rise to its feet. There are concrete data proving this fact which the Chinese do not dispute. At the time the Soviet Command turned over all the weapons captured from the Kwantung Army to the Chinese communists: 3,700 guns and mortars, 600 tanks, 860 aircraft, 12,000 machine-guns, all the ships of the Japanese Sungari Flotilla, and 680 army depots.

Soviet specialists also helped to raise and train an 800,000-strong Chinese army that became the striking force which played a decisive role in smashing the counter-revolutionary troops in China.

A Chinese leader said later: "If there had been no Soviet Union and if Japanese imperialism had not been routed, could we have won under those circumstances? Of course not."

Whose words are these? Mao Tse-tung's.

In addition to military aid, the Soviet Union after the war helped the PRC to rehabilitate its dislocated economy. It helped to build factories, railway trunk lines, bridges, and lines of communication, and organise the production of tractors, motor vehicles, turbines and aircraft. The USSR turned over to China free of charge 24,000 sets of scientific and technological documentation, including the blueprints of 1,400 large enterprises. Foreign experts have estimated that they would have been worth many thousands of millions of dollars on the world market.

It is quite obvious that were it not for this aid China would have hardly had a modern industry today.

And so is the USSR an enemy of China or is it its friend?

How did the Chinese leaders express their appreciation to the Soviet Union? In the first place by advancing fantastic territorial claims and displaying fierce hatred.

I am not a psychologist, and in general I do not believe that it is a question of the psychology of these men. Their cast of mind has nothing to do with it. It is all a matter of policy, but of a very strange kind.

Another pertinent question is why do the present Peking leaders find it necessary to contribute to the revival of Japanese militarism which, as one can imagine, is the sworn enemy of China itself and of dozens of other Asian states? Yet this is precisely what they are doing now.

It is no longer a secret that China is insisting on the conclusion of a Sino-Japanese military alliance spearheaded against the USSR. Its efforts have been welcomed with delight by the old militaristic circles in Japan which have long been dreaming of restoring their military machine. Addressing the Diet in the summer of 1978 Keiichi, the head of the Japanese Defence Agency, said outright that the Soviet Union was the main target of the development of Japan's military capability.

No beating about the bush here. Back in 1964 Mao Tse-tung in the above-mentioned conversation with Japanese socialist MPs publicly urged Japan to press its territorial claims to the so-called northern territories of the USSR, i.e. to the Kurile islands. Now the Japanese reactionaries themselves have began to talk about making the Soviet Union a target. And this, too, is not surprising, for with the Chinese to back them up, they are beginning to feel much better.

Neither the Soviet people, the peoples of Asia, the British and Americans, nor the Chinese themselves have forgotten what Japanese militarism had brought them all in the past. It was responsible for the death of millions. Who will stand to benefit if it ever revives?

Let us take a look at Europe where Chinese diplomacy is just as openly working towards the establishment of a military alliance between China and NATO. Here, too, influential military circles promptly and with considerable satisfaction pick up China's idea. Commander-in-chief of NATO integrated armed forces General Alexander Haig recently said that henceforth it would be logical to say that China was the 16th member of the Atlantic alliance.

The Soviet Union does not regard this as logical but as something totally different. Is it "logical" or just to think about joint military preparations by the United States, Western Europe and China against a country whose



decisive role in saving mankind from the nazi plague 34 years ago is universally recognised? I am sure the British remember this.

Yet Peking politicians spur the Europeans and the Americans into precisely such a venture. What, after all, do the Chinese want in that part of the world?

China is frenziedly militarising itself. It spends more than 40 per cent of its budget funds, or about a fourth of the national income, for military purposes. The people pay for this and go hungry. Weapons are purchased wherever possible. Chinese troops are being concentrated on the borders with the USSR and the Mongolian People's Republic, military installations are put up and subversive units formed. What is the purpose of all this activity? The thought that the Soviet Union intends to attack China may occur only to people who are not in their right mind.

What has Peking's meddling in the policy of the Old World in store for the Europeans?

Some Europeans would have been quite happy with such a course of events. But who?

In the first place the neo-fascists in different countries who plan to seize power on the ruins of European civilisation after the war.

In the second place, the West German revanchists who for more than thirty years are thinking of how to change the results of the Second World War, just as they had tried to change the results of the First.

I have no idea what Mrs Margaret Thatcher may have to say on this issue. But did the British remember Dunkirk and the blitz when in the spring of 1977 three former Wehrmacht generals, Hitler's favourites Trettner, von Kielmansegg and Steinhoff arrived in Peking for secret talks with Chinese political and military leaders.

It would have been a pity if they did not. I, for instance, was in London in that period and remember the one and the other. I think that millions of people in Britain have not forgotten them either. Have the heirs of the Wehrmacht re-educated themselves? Of course they haven't. Never and nowhere do militarists change their nature and turn into pacifists. Life fully confirms this.

As regards the German militarists, one thing is definite: being defeated they always and with incredible stubbornness wait for their hour to strike and then launch a counter-attack. And they will wait for decades if necessary.

When in May 1978 the Vice-Premier of the Peking Government Teng Hsiao-ping said that "in principle" he agreed with the evaluation of China as the "NATO of the East", it boded nothing good for Europe. One should remember the past and think of the future.

All of us see how China heightens tensions in Asia, conducts a political siege of Vietnam, cultivates hatred for India and offends the People's Republic of Mongolia.

It is absolutely clear that these countries, just as the USSR, have not the slightest intention of threatening China. Yet the attitude of the Chinese leaders to these states resembles that of the Chinese emperors of the past. Maoist China regards itself as the centre of the Earth and lays claim to the role of hegemon in Asia.

Perhaps all this is due to Peking's efforts to force these countries into joining the "sphere of influence" of the Chinese super-power just as Kampuchea has already done?

Indeed, what does China want from India, for instance? That huge country with a population of over 600 million has never demanded anything from China. Britain is well aware of this. Present-day India is known for its peaceful foreign policy.

In spite of that China laid claim to 130,000 square kilometres of Indian territory in the Himalayas already in 1959, and three years later seized part of it by force. At the same time Peking has been doing its best for years to incite (and arm!) the separatists in Nagaland, Manipur, Assam and Sikkim in the northeast and north of India. All this greatly resembles a plan for dismembering India under China's control.

I remember the "Tanaka plan" for conquering the whole or almost the whole of the Asian continent by the Japanese which was disclosed in the 1930s and 1940s. I am sure that the British, many of whom paid for this plan with their blood in the forties, have not forgotten it, too.



And now the last question but one: why does China meddle in African affairs?

China never had any trade interests on that continent. Even the Chinese emperors, who considered themselves God's vicegerents on earth, did not embark on any ventures on the "black continent". But not so modern China which promptly launches on an offensive against the liberation movements in Africa and comes to terms with the corrupt reactionary regime of Mobutu in Zaire, with the separatist UNITA bands which are trying to break into Angola, with Somalia whose troops invade Ethiopia, and, finally, with South Africa, the stronghold of the white racists in Africa.

What makes China collude with extreme rightist forces on the African continent? Evidently its desire to heat up the atmosphere, sow "dragon's teeth" and create a critical situation. In a word, to get this continent, too, to slide into a big war.

The British know Africa well. It was they who together with the French and the Belgians were the first to colonialise it and enslave its peoples. Today African countries, with the exception of South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia, are free. At the same time Africa remains one of the world's biggest suppliers of valuable raw materials for countries in other parts of the world. Peking wants to set this continent on fire, too. And this bodes ill for Britain as well.

Finally, a few words about China's role in another part of the world, Latin America. One question will suffice: why does "Left" China fraternise with the overtly fascist state of Chile and the regime of general Pinochet? It is common knowledge that Maoism and Chilean fascism are close friends, and both make a point of stressing this fact.

Such are the facts about China's activity and its policy in different countries and continents. Maoist China wants to be a world hegemon and not simply a super-power.

To achieve this end Peking works in two directions simultaneously. On the one hand, it does all it can to provoke a clash between the USSR and the West. And if ac-

cording to these calculations a world war does break out China plans to remain on the sidelines and then dictate its will to the surviving peoples.

On the other hand, Maoist China is also working on plans for seizing Asia and thus become a pan-Asian super-power with a population of over 2,000 million.

All these plans look fantastic, and quite obviously they are built on sand. Our generation has already seen what has happened to pretenders to world hegemony. Is there really any need to ask the British: have pretenders to world hegemony ever been deterred from attempts to achieve their ambitions no matter how fantastic their plans may have been?

History has already answered this question.

That is why the author finds it necessary to take up this crucial issue once again.

**Ernst Henry**

## 1. IT IS THE LIVING WHO NEED COMMUNISM

What role is China, the world's biggest nation with a population of over 700 million, destined to play in contemporary history?

This is a burning issue of our epoch, and much depends on the answer to it. The Chinese are one of the most ancient nations in the world. During their 5,000-year-long history they survived terrible storms and incredible ordeals, and suffered innumerable sacrifices. After the Second World War, many people thought that since the Chinese took the socialist road they would finally surmount some of the main difficulties inherited from the past. At the time China assumed a key position in the world political scene. How will it use this position now?

This question agitates the minds of all thinking people, and in order to answer it the matter should be examined more closely. Among other things it is necessary to comprehend not only the domestic but also the *foreign* policy of the present Peking leaders. As always, the one is inseverably connected with the other. Moreover, in many respects they determine each other.

The main, "long-term" guideline of the Peking group's foreign policy has been well known for several years already. It is designed to plunge mankind into an atomic cauldron. It would seem that only lunatics could think along such lines and desire this to happen. Yet it is true. The present Chinese leaders maintain that global war is

the highroad to "communism" and that to think otherwise is tantamount to believing in "paper tigers".

From the very beginning this was the source of one of the main disagreements between them and the Communists of the whole world, including many prominent Communists in China itself. The course of instigating a third world war was one of the key reasons which motivated the Peking leaders to abandon the world communist movement and rely on hordes of misguided youngsters. For a long time all of us sensed that this dispute is neither over academic abstractions, theoretical formulas nor words, but over something definite and exceptionally important for all people.

The question of war and peace became the most important issue in the latter half of the twentieth century. It continues to confront us day after day, posing itself in different parts of the world and taking its place on the agenda in one aspect or another. It will be just as topical tomorrow or the day after. It concerns all people wherever they live and whatever camp they belong to. It is even more important for those who want to build a new society in the world.

Like everybody else they can approach the problem from different angles. But I would like to examine it from only one standpoint. How best to secure the future? Does the road to communism pass through peaceful coexistence, or through a nuclear holocaust? That, in fact, is how the question is raised in Peking.

In recent years a great deal has been written and spoken about the possible death toll a nuclear war would exact. The general opinion is that it would kill hundreds of millions of people. No one can say exactly how many –a third, a half of the world's population or more. All sorts of conjectures are made.

The distinguished American scientist Linus Pauling has estimated that there are enough nuclear weapons in the world today to kill the population of the world twice over. If, as Western experts maintain, the per capita destructive capacity of nuclear stockpiles in the world was equal to ten tons of TNT already several years ago, then



there is no need to indulge in any additional calculations. It is meaningless to argue about the exact figures. Even experts cannot estimate how many lives will be lost or imagine the full magnitude of the catastrophe.

Peking poses another question, and it must be answered. Is it necessary to sacrifice a considerable part of humanity to ensure a better future for the rest? We could add: should this be done if the same goal could be achieved without such sacrifices?

Today the answer to this question is more definite than ever before. It is provided neither by atomic scientists, nor by hydrogen bomb specialists nor by mathematicians specialising in the theory of probability. It is supplied by ordinary people, those who have dedicated themselves to the struggle for a better world, and it is absolutely conclusive: it is the living who need peace, not the dead.

Yes, revolutionaries have always been prepared to sacrifice themselves for their cause. There are no or almost no revolutions without losses. The class struggle, the underground struggle of the Marxist parties, civil wars, wars against interventionists, and national liberation wars have always taken and will continue to take a heavy toll of human life. One can understand the self-sacrificing dedication of the revolutionaries. But what is the sense of sacrificing humanity? What is the sense of sacrificing even one part of it for the sake of another if under conditions of peaceful coexistence and the steady development of the world revolutionary process the victory of socialist ideas is inevitable.

The opinion that in order to rebuild the world it is necessary to blow it up first belongs to the anarchists and not the Marxists. Today it is shared by others–imperialists, and fascists who dream about another Hitler. Hamburg professor Helmut Thielicke urged Christians to be prepared as a last resort in order to avert a "Communist hell" "to use the atomic bomb" "to help bring about the total destruction of everything that has been created". When the revanchist William Schlamm was asked whether he would have voted for war even if a hundred million

people would perish in it, he unhesitatingly replied: "Yes."

That's what Hitler's contemporary disciples think. There is quite a number of them and they are waiting for an opportune moment to act. They will miss no opportunity to translate their words into deeds. All of them belong to the old society and have been driven to frenzy by their futile efforts to preserve this society by peaceful means. If they had the choice of either reconciling themselves to the historically inevitable social demise of their class, or blowing up the planet, they would prefer the latter.

This is not an overstatement: it is about time people got used to fantastic notions which are expressed in the 20th century. Describing the sentiments and plans of the "hawks" in the US who demand that the development of nuclear weapons should be continued at all costs, the reputed American politician Adlai Stevenson said back in 1960: If the US continued to work in this direction then by 1980, perhaps even earlier, scientific progress would lead to the discovery of a way of setting off an absolute explosion, when by pressing a button it would be possible to reduce the globe to ashes. This would be supersuicide which would put an end to all overkill methods.

I repeat, there is no reason to be surprised. For some ideologists of the dying class insanity in politics is just as commonplace as the incidence of dementia among people suffering from progressive paralysis. But why should the ideologists of the young, victorious class already standing on the threshold of a new world, which it is building with its own hands, lose their heads and fall into despair?

The living need communism. In this axiom the idea of socialist humanism fuses with considerations of socialist strategy. An explosion of the planet will not resolve the problems of the world revolutionary process.

One can say that it is not a question of the planet's future. That, in the final analysis, it is "only" a question of the destiny of just so many hundreds of millions of people.



Perhaps this is true. But from the standpoint of modern technology such reservations are not very convincing. It is impossible to define the limits of a nuclear war once it gets under way. Exploding, hydrogen bombs do not count how many millions of people they kill. Radiation does not stop at frontier posts. And if a world war begins, where and when it ends will not depend on those who intend to use it to further their own ends. Neither can anyone be sure that the lot of the survivors who will have to live in a polluted environment will be a better one than that of the dead.

Let us suppose that a nuclear war kills only a part of the world population. But what part of it? – that is the question.

In order to answer it all abstract formulas have to be put aside and the future soberly surveyed. The anarchists had once advanced the theory "sacrifice the small for the sake of the big". Let us look at the map and try to imagine what will happen today if this theory is translated into practice. What is a nuclear war as viewed from the point of view of social strategy, the strategy of the international class struggle and not from the standpoint of human interests and humanism? Knowing the contemporary alignment of military forces and the location of the possible fronts between them we can easily supply the answer. It is asserted in Peking that capitalism and the monopoly bourgeoisie will be destroyed in the course of the war. This is obvious. But will it be the bourgeoisie alone that will perish?

Three continents, Europe, North America and Asia, will be the hardest hit. It cannot be expected that any of them will be unaffected. The most vulnerable region will be Western Europe where the "hawks" of imperialism plan to set up the main front.

Let us translate military strategic terminology into its social equivalent. In the event of a world nuclear war the existence of the French working class, the class which established the Paris Commune and which from the very beginning was in the vanguard of the revolutionary movement in the West, will be placed in jeopardy. The Ital-

ian proletariat, the founder of the biggest Communist Party in the capitalist world, might be exterminated. The progressive forces in Italy have long been preparing to take the future of their country into their own hands and are making steady progress in this direction.

A nuclear war could deprive socialism of the German proletariat. The German working-class movement gave the world Marx and Engels in the past century. In the 20th century it managed to survive 12 terrible years of fascism. But such a war could wipe it off the map of Europe within several hours or days. The heroic proletariat of Spain, which endured the horrors of fascism for almost thirty years, would be sacrificed at the nuclear altar.

A nuclear war could sentence the working class of Britain to death. Military experts have estimated that 20 megaton bombs could turn that country into lifeless desert. The greater part of British workers are still subject to reformist influence. But does this mean that no concern should be shown for their future? When a leader of the British Communists who was on a visit in Peking explained to the Chinese leaders that a third world war could wipe out the relatively small British nation to the last man, he was told: Where is it said that a world socialist society should be built with the participation of Englishmen?

Can this be regarded as a communist point of view?

There is no need for other examples. Social geography answers our question with the utmost clarity. In the event of an atomic war it will be the continents with the most highly developed economy and the biggest working class that will be exposed to the greatest danger. Eight of the 14 socialist states are situated on one of these continents, including, partially, the USSR, the world's first and most powerful of them, and one which has made the greatest headway towards communism. On the same continent there is the oldest and most developed working-class movement in the capitalist world. To sacrifice it would be tantamount to repudiating everything on what Marx, Engels and Lenin had built their teaching and from what they had proceeded.



Can this be regarded as a "small sacrifice"?

But that's not all. "Nuclear geography" embraces not only Europe and America. In our age of nuclear missiles it is impossible to separate the destinies of continents. There was a time when the ill-fated Pentagon strategists tried to set off one state against another in the hope that one of them would survive at the expense of the other. But even they shelved these plans long ago.

A world war will envelop both the United States and the regions of the adjoining oceans. There is not a shadow of doubt that in the event of a world conflagration the reactionary blocs and the 5th and 7th US fleets would try to go into action in Asia, just as NATO would commit its armed forces in Europe. But the USSR is not the only existing Asian power. China, too, would be one of the first countries to encounter the imperialist aggression in Asia. That can be taken for granted. According to some sources a half of China's population would perish, and there is no saying what will happen to the other half which will be exposed to radiation. But the international working class is against such a totally unwarranted sacrifice. It is no less concerned with the interests of the socialist revolution in Asia, and the future of the peoples of China, Vietnam, Korea, Japan and other Asian countries, than with the destiny of the peoples of other continents. It would be the greatest of crimes to place the cause of the Chinese people at the mercy of the atomic bomb. How can anyone even consider the idea of dooming Vietnam to destruction.

Not a single continent should be sacrificed. It is unthinkable that the vanguard of humanity, which is advancing towards communism, should be arbitrarily hurled into a thermonuclear conflagration. Only the imperialists and demented nationalists would like this to happen. It is unthinkable that the main forces of the world socialist system and the most valuable, indispensable cadres of the working-class and the national liberation movement in the capitalist world should be allowed to come under fire. It is unthinkable to play into the hands of the imperialist "hawks" who are trying to drag the whole of

humanity into an abyss. It is the living who need communism.

And so we arrive at the last and, practically, perhaps, the most important question. If that is how matters stand and not a single person in his right mind can doubt this, then how can one explain the attitude of the extremists in Peking? Why have they no qualms at all in sacrificing communism's vital interests?

There is only one answer. They are not interested in communism: they are thinking of something totally different. They use communist ideas to camouflage their efforts to attain a diametrically opposite goal: to create under their hegemony a new imperial "system" in Asia and even outside its confines. Once this is taken into account everything falls into place. Logically enough the authors of such plans are hardly concerned with the working-class movement in the Western hemisphere and with preserving contemporary world culture. They regard a global war as a short cut to their insane goals. We have not forgotten the precedents.

This path will bring the Chinese people neither prosperity nor greatness. Neither can China's role in contemporary history be fruitful and worthy of that great country if it acts in keeping with such principles. On the contrary, it has already forfeited much of what it had gained when it took the socialist road twenty years ago, and it can forfeit a great deal more, lose time and inflict severe wounds on itself. It is not youngsters driven to frenzy who can resolve Asia's urgent social, economic and political problems. When the history of our century will be written, the chapter on China will undoubtedly note that the efforts of the Peking nationalists to push it into an abyss proved futile.

*1967*

## 2. A GLANCE FROM THE PAMIRS

The Pamirs, the navel of Asia and one of the most mysterious regions of the world. Great mountain ranges with soaring peaks reminiscent of Roerich's canvasses protect it from all sides; the Tien Shans in the north, Karakoram and Kunlun in the east, Hindu Kush and the Himalayas in the south and the Afghan mountains in the West. Next to it lies India and Pakistan, and beyond the passes spreads China. A region of stern silence, it is bathed in pink, reddish and violet hues which glow strangely in the rarefied air. An arrival from the valley is overwhelmed with a feeling of being on another planet.

At times this feeling becomes almost tangible. The pulse quickens to 150 a minute. Movements become flaccid, and the slightest exertion makes the head spin. The latitude is the same as that of Southern Greece, Southern Spain and Sicily, i.e., of the sunny Mediterranean. But the mean temperature is the same as on the Kola Peninsula jutting out into the White Sea. Is it really a part of the Earth?

"... It is a kingdom of deadly cold and gusty winds," wrote the Chinese traveller Suen-tsang 1,300 years ago, who was the first to mention this region. "It snows winter and summer. The soil is impregnated with salt and thickly carpeted with gravel. There is grim desert everywhere without a trace of human habitation."

"You do not meet with any habitations ... or the appearance of verdure," wrote Marco Polo who made an

arduous journey across the Pamirs from India to China six centuries later. "... So great is the height of the mountains that no birds are to be seen near their summits.... From the keenness of the air, fires when lighted do not give the same heat as in lower situations, nor produce the same effect in dressing victuals."[1]

That was practically all the information about the Pamirs which was available in the 18th century. Legends were circulated about the mysterious mountain range. Neighbouring tribes called it "the roof of the world" or "the pedestal of death". Some said that it hid a kingdom of dwarfs, while others maintained that the great Mount Meru, the realm of the gods, towered there, in the very centre of the earth. And some people still insist that the inaccessible crevices over the precipices shelter the abominable snowman.

Not far beyond the Alai Range sprawls the Ferghana Valley, smiling under the dazzling sun. But here there is a gloomy kingdom of colossal mountains wrapped in dignified aloofness, neither worried nor caring for man and his affairs. It seems that up here one is not permitted to think about what is happening down below, and that it remains only to gaze upon the grandiose scenery and let it enthral you. But our contemporary has "political vision" which he cannot allow to be obscured even upon ascending the roof of the world where breathing is a great effort.

I endeavour to look beyond the mountains surrounding the Pamirs and discern the contours of contemporary Asian history.

I gaze southward, across the passes and the Hindu Kush and the Himalayas. What immediately strikes the eye in that part of Asia is the drastic turn that has taken place in its history.

The turn was both irreversible and decisive. A mere twenty years ago India was the biggest, and as many believed, the most indestructible colonial empire of the world. The British who owned India for two centuries be-

[1] *The Travels of Marco Polo*, London, 1818, p. 142.



lieved that they would remain there for ever. The white sahibs whom Kipling extolled in his books regarded themselves as higher beings, invincible and all-knowing, whom it was useless to resist. The heirs of the East India Company were preparing to do what neither Alexander the Great nor Genghis Khan were able to accomplish: they intended to advance in Asia to the East, West and North, girdle the continent with a chain extending from the Persian Gulf to the Pacific Ocean, link the Mediterranean area and Africa to it, and then establish Britain's dictatorship over the world.

This was neither a dream, nor a romantic fantasy. It was a considered businesslike plan. That was how two men, Lord Curzon and Winston Churchill, who influenced British foreign policy in the current century more than anyone else, visualised the course of Asian history. While continuing their game in Europe, they paid even greater attention to Asia in the course of many years. Both were sure that already in the first half of the 20th century the British Indian Empire would become an all-Asian empire and thus usher in a new era, the era of pax Britannica. Burma, Ceylon, Nepal, Malaya, Iraq and Palestine already belonged to the masters of British India, who were putting out their feelers to Tibet and Afghanistan, and were wrapping them around Sinkiang and the whole of the south of China up to Shanghai and the Yangtze. They had the Dutch rulers of Indonesia under their thumb, dominated the Arab princedoms, imposed their will on Iran and were getting ready to seize Soviet Central Asia. Moreover they planned to hoist the British flag in the Pamirs, the roof of the world, which remained in the focus of London's attention since the days of the Kokand Khanate. Everything was planned for decades ahead.

In order to understand Britain's policy of the preceding decades correctly one has to take these plans into account. For many years the project of a great British Asian Empire remained the pivot of the strategy of the Talleyrands on the Thames. Had this project been realised, London would have indeed become, as Curzon and Chur-

chill wanted, another Rome and it would have been necessary to alter the political map of the world.

This was what could be observed south of the Pamirs a few decades ago or just yesterday from a historian's point of view. Thousands of books have been written about the might of the British Indian Empire and its future. But what has remained of it today? Not even a wisp of smoke. It disappeared like a mirage.

Kipling's invincible sahibs fled the mid-Asian scene so meekly and hastily that nations which for ages lived under their yoke even did not have to rebel against them. The 200-year-old edifice crumbled in what in historical terms was not more than a moment. Even such an astute bourgeois politician as Churchill failed to see what was actually happening until it was all over. And when the frightened British Government granted India, Pakistan and Burma independence, he vehemently opposed the torpedoing of the British Empire. Later, when other Asian nations began to discard the British yoke, the British historian Arthur Bryant raged about the mendacity, knavery, unscrupulousness, tyranny and hatred of the countries which had put away their fear of Britain. Unexpectedly Asian reality proved to be incomprehensible to British officials who had always considered themselves unsurpassed specialists in Asian affairs.

But Kipling is dead. Some may have forgotten his heroes. Where they had once ruled and from where they planned to dictate their will to the whole world, the flags of two young sovereign Asian states flutter today. The wheels of history will never turn back in the region that spreads from the Himalayas to the Indian Ocean and is inhabited by 600 million people.

No more empires will be built in contemporary Asia. This is the first thing that becomes apparent when one uses his political vision and gazes from the Pamirs to the south.

What do we see if we turn to the southwest? The fall of another, even though partially completed Asian empire, in this case an empire of the militarist neo-colonialist type.



In less than a decade after the collapse of the British Indian bastion, NATO headquarters devised a plan for building another "system" in Asia, but further west and closer to oil, and along other, more "modern", lines. In keeping with a decision taken by London and Washington four countries lying between Asia Minor and India–Pakistan, Iran, Turkey and Iraq–were entered into a military pact whose leadership was officially assumed by Britain. The world witnessed the birth of the Baghdad pact, now called CENTO, which embraced a territory even bigger than the former British India. Its two main tasks were to organise a "second" NATO front in a northerly direction against the Caucasus and Soviet Central Asia, to protect the British-American oil empire in the Arab countries and Iran in the south, and, at the same time, to threaten neutral Afghanistan on the flank.

The aims of this bloc in Western Asia were clear. Now, however, the helm was not in the hands of the incompetent sahibs, but controlled by colonialists of a higher calibre and of the latest type. American Asian experts became CENTO's heart and soul. It was firmly believed overseas that they would accomplish what had once proved to be an impossible task for the British. CENTO was founded 12 years ago. Is it still alive?

They say it is. At least that is what its founders claim. Rumour has it that the generals who stand at the head of CENTO still hold meetings from time to time, hand down resolutions and issue directives and instructions. Other sources, however, say that the meetings of its leaders now resemble gatherings of shadows. The bloc has its headquarters, and its strategic dispositions lie in folders, but nothing came of its efforts to muster an army. Something totally different has happened: the US military empire that was being built in the Middle East came to resemble the Tower of Babel.

First Iraq dropped out. Then Pakistan, Turkey and Iran began to strengthen their independence and chose to normalise their relations with the Soviet Union. The gravitation towards neutralism is becoming more and more pronounced throughout the region. There is talk about

revising the old military agreements with the United States. But that's not all. In the summer of 1967, during the critical days of the Arab-Israeli conflict it was confirmed that the stand of Pakistan, Iran and Turkey on this issue did not coincide with America's attitude. So what is the outlook for CENTO?

A serious observer will not fail to see that the organisers of this bloc have been forced to withdraw to the extreme southwest of Asia, closer to the bases of the US 6th Fleet thousands of kilometres away from the Pamirs. It is also clear that the flames that have enveloped the Arab East are beginning to lick them, too. And those who would have liked to build a new formidable "system" in the Middle East are on the verge of being besieged themselves. That, too, is a decisive shift in the situation.

Does CENTO's lot foreshadow the lot of SEATO, ANZUS, ASEAN and other US blocs in Asia? That is another question which revolves in the mind of a person who gazes from "the roof of the world" to the southwest.

Asia is moving forward. Anyone who thinks that the changes which got underway on this continent after the Second World War are coming to a stop in the sixties is profoundly mistaken. He is simply myopic. The Asian revolution continues in spite of unexpected obstacles and complications. Naturally, its enemies do not intend to surrender their positions. The two bastions, one in the southwest and the other in the southeast of Asia, which are still in their hands do not cease fire, but, on the contrary, intensify their bombardment. This is particularly true of the southeast. It is quite possible that the struggle for Asia will become even more intense. But for a historian who looks ahead not over weeks or months, but over years and decades, the question of its future is in effect decided. There is no return to the past.

One thing is definite. If Asia gets a chance to continue its advance without atomic bombs and nuclear explosions, under conditions of the peaceful coexistence of the two social systems, it will inevitably pave the way for itself in spite of any and all foreign political or armed interventions. The entire image of this continent may radically change in the last third of the current century. And it is difficult to imagine how significant this will be.



Asia has the most terrible past of the five continents of the world. Europe's suffering was greater only in the 20th century. Feudalism in its most bestial form was rampant in Asia. For centuries the Asian peoples remained in the path of barbaric invasions. Nowhere else was human life valued so cheaply. Whole towns were reduced to ashes and areas as large as a European state were razed to the ground. Nowhere else, prior to Hitler, were there such maniacal, power-mad tyrants as in Asia where one despot replaced another. Nowhere else was there such appalling and interminable poverty, such an endless succession of epidemics, such merciless colonial oppression and such chronic famine. "This is a bleeding process with a vengeance!" Marx wrote in 1881 about the situation in India. "The famine years are pressing each other and *in dimensions* till now not yet suspected in Europe!"[1] Even Africa which suffered so much from colonialism came under its yoke much later. Century after century, Asia, the largest continent which occupies a third of the world's land surface and is the seat of the world's most ancient culture, was unable to rise to its feet and take its place alongside Europe and America. The time will come when this will be regarded as one of the most striking, even though natural, paradoxes of history rooted in specific economic and political reasons. The Marxist history of Asia, which will be written by the coming generations, will be a breathtakingly dramatic work.

Now, it appears, the worst has been left behind: the road is open. If peace and freedom are consolidated in Asia, then its transformation into a socialist continent is inevitable. There is no need to dwell on the influence which its development in this direction will have on the entire course of contemporary history. Undoubtedly its peoples now hold one of the most important keys to the future of the whole world. But their ability to turn this

[1] Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1975, p. 317.

key depends on two conditions: world peace, and the class and national liberation struggle. Then there will be an Asia without Genghis Khans and Tamerlanes, without Curzons and McNamaras.

...I head for Osh. The road follows the border with Sinkiang and again I delight in the suddenly appearing and disappearing Roerich landscape, and it seems to me that the shapes of the giant mountains quiver and change.

But we still have not given a glance to the east of the Pamirs. We set out for Murghab on the eastern fringe of the mountain range. The breath-taking scenery with its bluish-violet, pink and yellow hues stands before our eyes. Magic summits soar over stupendous precipices. The heat is like in the tropics during the daylight hours, but the nights are bitingly cold. Breathing becomes difficult. They say that the oxygen content of the air here is 40 per cent below normal. There are no habitations in sight now, only a felt hut here and there. Probably Marco Polo passed here on his way to the Chinese emperor. And once again it seems to the newcomer that he is on a different planet.

Not so long ago the journey from Khorog to the nearest Kirghiz town beyond the northeastern fringe of the mountain range had to be made on horseback and lasted over a month. The difficult mountain passes were accessible only to yaks. In winter, with its piercing frosts and hurricane-force winds, the Pamirs are sealed off from the rest of the world. According to the old explorers people lived here like the polar seafarers of the past did in their ice-locked ships. But now the earth cracks from the heat.

Yet man is beginning to bend nature to his will here, too. For thousands of years nothing changed in this unique part of the world. It seemed that life was gradually coming to a standstill and that nothing new would ever grow here. Nowhere else is it so difficult to conquer nature and reorganise human society as in the Pamirs. Still socialism is now doing both these things. This, however, is not the subject of this article.



We pass through the township of Murghab, formerly the Post Pamirsky fortress, the region's eastern centre, and take the road to Lake Karakul. China is just a few kilometres away: beyond the Sarikol Range lies Sinkiang. This is the eastern direction where, in our efforts to catch a glimpse of Asian reality from the "roof of the world", we still have not looked.

It will be remembered that in the area to the south and to the west of the Pamirs we observed that Asia was moving forward, unevenly, breathing heavily as it negotiated the ruts and bumps but advancing all the same. Everywhere we could see that attempts to hold on to the old Asian empires and military "systems" or to build new ones ended in failure. South and West Asia no longer tolerate any kind of colonial or military-autocratic "superstates". So what do we see beyond the Sarikol Range ?

A historian may find the answer quite strange. Facts appear to indicate that a directly opposite process is beginning to take shape here, in the Asian East. Under the banner of so-called "Left socialism", or Maoism, frenzied efforts have been made over the past several years to set up something in the nature of an Asian Reich.

What is the Mao group's actual objective? What is the ultimate aim of the present Chinese leaders' aggressive policy which continuously amazes the whole world?

The paper scenery on the Peking stage is painted in such bright colours as to make the uninitiated spectators hold their breath. It is asserted that Mao has opened a new era in history in which he will surpass Marx and Lenin and raise his banner over the whole world. It is reported or intimated that he will produce something unparalleled and grandiose, and that what he has planned to achieve will last hundreds, thousands and even tens of thousands of years. Lesser terms are not taken into consideration.

A closer scrutiny of the Maoists' foreign policy over the past decade will reveal that there is nothing new, unprecedented and inexplicable in it. It is as old as the world. The time has come to scrutinise it more thoroughly.

There is no longer any doubt that Peking's motto "the wind blows from the East" conceals a concrete plan, a brainchild of the Chinese nationalists, evidently conceived back in the fifties and lately referred to in China as the "great strategic plan". There is no difficulty in spelling out the plan's foreign policy aspects. Its substance is crude and primitive. The basic idea of the most extreme chauvinists in Peking is clearly confined to the creation of some sort of a super-state which would embrace not only East, but also Central and, eventually, even West Asia. It is hardly possible to interpret it differently.

Owing to some of its points the "great plan" bears a striking resemblance to the once notorious Tanaka plan which was drawn up by the Japanese brass and envisaged a phased conquest of Asia. According to world press reports the great Chinese super-state will include, besides China, also Korea, the Mongolian People's Republic, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Indonesia, Malaysia, Burma and some other countries in that part of the world. The second phase of the "storm from the East" envisages expansion in the direction of other parts of the Far and even the Middle East. So far it is not clear what will happen during the third stage. One thing, however, is obvious: that the plan is not confined solely to the Maoisation of Asia. "We shall proudly look upon the five continents," stated a Chinese official. "The present of China is the morrow of the whole world," declared Peking's mouthpiece *Jenmin jihpao*. The existence of such plans is also reported with anxiety by the press of countries neighbouring on China.

In the heat of a polemic politicians, like all other people, sometimes indulge in over-statements. And, of course, not all Chinese nationalists should be taken seriously. But what we have here is a very definite programme. It appears that there is not a single continent which at one stage or another has not been earmarked for inclusion into the Maoisation process. When such schemers fall into a trance they, like opium addicts, have all sorts of hallucinations, and geography, like politics,



ceases to be an obstacle. They easily think of time in terms of millennia, of space in thousands of kilometres and of past experience in seconds. Reality is ignored, and they see the world as they want to see it.

But hallucinations turn into decisions. It is common knowledge that at one or another stage of the plan for the establishment of an Asian Reich, its authors envisaged, and in some respects quite possibly envisage today, too, the formation of Peking-Tokyo, Peking-Jakarta, Peking-Arab East and other axes as stepping stones to its realisation. Everything is done according to the classic rules of empire-building. Everything remains on paper. But opium continues to do its work and the trance continues.

Statements by Peking representatives disclose the fact that they have also determined what should foreshadow the implementation of the "great plan" in order to pave the way for it. What they have in mind is a third world war. Maoist diplomacy cannot imagine the fulfilment of its main programme without a global atomic holocaust in the course of which, judging by the admissions of the Chinese leaders themselves, one-third or even one half of humanity may perish and the world would rock. That explains why year in and year out it does its best to aggravate international tension and fan the flames of any conflict in any part of the world. One thing stems from another. Peaceful coexistence is incompatible with "Mao's plan". Hence Peking's vicious anti-Sovietism and the violence of the hungweipings. Evidently these rampaging teenagers have already been promised that sooner or later they would be allowed to act at will not only within China's borders. This is directly borne out by their outrageous actions at the gates of foreign embassies in Peking and the disgusting behaviour of Chinese students in the capitals of other countries.

This, according to all indications, is what lies behind Chinese foreign policy today. The essence remains the same from whatever side it is examined. For a sane person the schemes of the Chinese extremists resemble the ravings of a madman, a nightmarish phantasmagoria.

But this does not mean that they are imaginary. A student of history knows that its pages abound in insane plans.

Is it possible to regard the developments taking place in China as healthy policy? And do not some of the recent events in Indonesia, the incidents on the Chinese-Indian border, in Burma, in the Mongolian People's Republic coincide with the draft provisions of the "great plan"? Maoist practice strikingly conforms to "theory", although results are totally different from those anticipated by "theoreticians". In any case, it will be necessary to continue keeping a close watch over the map of Asia from this point of view.

Who needs the Peking-conceived super-state system, and for what purpose? The old empires in Asia are in ruins, neocolonialist blocs are splitting at the seams, but east of the Pamirs the blueprints of a new empire are being prepared. How else can one explain China's present policy. Its inspirers intimate that Peking's hegemony in Asia and eventually in Africa and Latin America (and perhaps even in Europe) is essential in the interests of socialism. Maoist China is destined to become the new centre of world communism, they claim. Is that the case? Can one imagine Genghis Khan as a socialist?

Let's for a moment imagine that the impossible has happened, that Maoist China, having survived the atomic holocaust, has become the world hegemon. Will that hasten the construction of a world socialist society? Will the shift of the "centre of world development" to East Asia, as is planned in Peking, expedite the victory of communism? There is no need to stop and think of an answer. Quite obviously such a shift would have put off the final victory of communism for an incalculable period.

It is not only a question of the Chinese economy continuing to lag many decades behind the level of the highly industrialised countries. Even more important is that in spite of Mao's calculations a thermonuclear war would inevitably cause such terrible destruction in the whole of East Asia that it would require the labour of many generations, no one can say exactly how many, to bring things back to normal. A still backward economy



and one which, moreover, would be subjected to a storm of radiation blasts all chances for rapid progress or a leap towards communist society. This is an axiom, not a hypothesis.

A short while ago the Peking leadership declared that the building of socialism in China was a long-term prospect requiring "not tens but a hundred and even hundreds of years". Who will benefit if the already existing highly-developed base of the world socialist community is replaced by a backward one? Only the imperialists in the camp of the extreme "ultras" would have liked to plunge the USSR, i.e. that part of the socialist community which stands closest to communism, into a thermonuclear maelstrom.

To follow this path does not mean a gain in time for socialism at the expense of bloodshed, but a loss of both time and blood, and so much of the one and the other that it is hard to imagine any worse path. That is why Peking's foreign and domestic policies are incompatible with the historical interests of the international working-class movement.

Marxism-Leninism, whatever its national version, has nothing to do with it. Who indeed is really interested in the "great plan"? Not the Chinese people. There is no saying how many Chinese would remain alive if that plan was carried into effect, and the most conscious part of the Chinese people (not to be confused with the teen-age hungweipings) is well aware of this. But there *is* a group of people in China who are enamoured of its present foreign policy.

It is a group of chauvinistic militarists who at present constitute the principal mainstay of the regime in Peking and without which no step is taken there. Those who belong to this group care nothing for the people, for socialism and for the world communist movement. This simply does not interest them and they are wholly absorbed with something else. The Chinese military autocracy is dreaming of a new "world" state which would officially act under the banner of socialism, but in effect would emulate the aggressive policy of the Chinese em-

3—1213

perors and mandarines of the long forgotten days, of those feudal times when some of China's neighbours, such as Burma and Vietnam, for example, were dependent on it.

It looks as though the leaders of the militaristic group would have liked to become 20th century Genghis Khans armed with the hydrogen bomb. And although every sane person is aware that this is an absurd plan either from the political, economic, military-political or any other aspect, its authors continue their frantic dance on the brink of the precipice. Things like that have also been known to happen in the past.

No. No new empires will appear east of the Pamirs, too. What existed centuries ago will not return to life under any new flag. Emperors may try to return to life. But there can be no socialist empire.

We gazed intently in three directions across the mountain passes of the Pamirs—to the south, west and east. From the roof of the world we had an especially striking view of how the Asian scene changed before our eyes. The times of great empires on that continent, the times of the Genghis Khans, Tamerlanes, Abbassides, Curzons and Tanakas will never return. No new blocs and axes, whatever the colour they are painted, will reverse the course of history on this storm-shaken continent.

...I cast another look at the fantastic landscape, breathe deeply of the pure air of the gigantic mountains and think of the time when a new Asia will score its ultimate victory.

*1967*

## 3. PONDERING THE FUTURE

Nowadays New Year's eve is an occasion which prompts many people to ponder more deeply than ever before what the future has in store not only for them but for the whole world, and how will mankind usher in the next year and the years to come.

Once these questions occupied the minds of a handful of professional politicians, historians, philosophers, stockjobbers, and intellectuals with a predilection for general discourses and arguments. Now they are on the minds and lips of millions of people, and quite probably of each person wherever he may be living and whatever his occupation. Never before has private life been so dependent on international politics. It is impossible to separate the one from the other. For the man in the street international affairs, whether he wants it or not, have become just as important and crucial as the question of earning his daily bread. That is why when drinking to the New Year people think out loud or to themselves: what will be in the papers tomorrow?

Pessimism has been in vogue in Western bourgeois circles for a long time already. The most ominous theories are circulated year after year. One of these theories, which is gaining increasing popularity in the camp of the "ultras" and "hawks", says world wars should be regarded as a new law of nature, and, therefore, unavoidable. It is also asserted that there is an inexorable mathematical periodicity of global wars, and that according to calculations based on this premise the world will witness at least one more catastrophe this century.

Once again we have to deal with the sphere of political psychopathy. Not a very pleasant occupation. But past experience shows that political psychopathy cannot be deleted from contemporary history.

It will be opportune to recall the name of the man who formulated the idea of the periodicity of world wars.

On September 18, 1934 several American newspapers devoted the space usually occupied by Walter Lippmann's column to an interview with the German philosopher Oswald Spengler, author of the book *Decline of the West*, which created such a stir in the world in the 1920s because it predicted an early collapse of modern civilisation. The interview was signed by the American businessman Stanley P. Lovell who later held a high post in the US intelligence. Lovell wrote that his conversation with Spengler in Munich made him feel as if he had spent a day with Voltaire.

What did Spengler tell Lovell? He warned the American secret agent that the Second World War would begin five years later, in 1939.

His theory, Lovell wrote, was that it required so many years for a culture to harden into a civilisation and then to progress to its decline and extinction. Towards its later years there were always, he said, three world wars. In the Egyptian culture, that of the Upper and the Lower Nile; in China that of the Five Contending States; in the Classical Age the three Punic wars between Rome and Carthage. In our days, he said, we would have the three wars also. The first two would settle no issues. It was only when men who had never seen war first hand were available that another world conflict could start. Here we were in 1934. World War I was in 1914. A generation is twenty-five years, so World War II would begin in 1939. It would settle nothing, of course, as it historically awaited the Third War and only in that one would the issues be resolved.

Lovell asked Spengler whether the Third World War would break out in 1964. The latter said yes and added that there would always be talk about the existence of new weapons and that a war would never take place.



But it would, he said, and recalled Cato's words: "For the rest, I vote that Carthage should be destroyed."

By saying Carthage the Munich soothsayer clearly meant the USSR.

Such was Spengler's view in 1934. Confirmation of this is to be found in old newspaper files. Lovell included the interview in his book of reminiscences entitled *Of Spies and Stratagems* published in New York in 1963.

In some respects the predictions of the oracle of the German bourgeoisie seemed to be correct. Though he failed to understand what would actually take place during the Second World War and foresee its outcome–it ended in the destruction of fascist "Rome" and not red "Carthage"–he did correctly predict the year when it would begin. Evidently he simply proceeded from a specific guideline of the imperialist General Staffs that every new major war required the existence of a new battleworthy young generation, i.e. an interval of approximately 25 years.

Similar views, for example, were entertained by Erich Ludendorff, the most prominent of the Kaiser's strategists, who maintained that Germany needed peaceful periods in its life only as a necessary break to prepare for another war. Hitler went even further. It will be remembered that he considered that a break of 25 years between world wars was much too long, and insisted that 20 and even 15 years would be enough. "For the benefit of the German people," Hitler told his associates on the night of August 19-20, 1941, "we should strive to have wars every 15-20 years. The army, whose sole objective is preservation of peace, only plays at soldiers ... or constitutes a revolutionary threat to its country." Thus, according to Hitler, there had to be three or even four world wars in the lifetime of a single person, if, of course, he managed to survive.

This was the view of the old fascists and militarists. The thoughts of the modern ones are not much different. There are more than enough Ludendorffs, Hitlers and Spenglers in miniature in the offices of the Pentagon and the Bundeswehr headquarters. They speak a different lan-

guage, more sophisticated and less candid: the schedules of the aggression planned in their dispositions are necessarily different. But the basic idea is the same: there is no avoiding a world war.

The reason is obvious, and the West's pessimism quite natural. Looking into the future the ideologists and strategists of the classes which are departing from the historical scene see nothing but darkness, chaos and the end of everything. It is not surprising, therefore, that they are prepared to goad the world to suicide. But what can we say when the same ideas and forecasts reach us from another hemisphere, in translation from the Chinese?

Spengler died quite a long time ago. We don't know whether the present Peking rulers have ever read the works of this, one of the most reactionary German bourgeois philosophers of our age. But as we reread some of their own forecasts it does appear that they have taken the main idea directly from Spengler's writings.

The man who predicted the "decline of the West" maintained that there would be three world wars and that only the third one would provide the solution by opening the door to a "new culture". Chinese politicians declare that ours is an epoch of world carnages, that a third world war is inevitable and that it alone will give humanity the hope of creating a new "civilisation a thousand times higher than the old one". What they have in mind is a devastating world war and not only the just wars of national liberation.

Here is a quotation proving this point:

"Is it possible to imagine how many human lives would be lost in the next war? Perhaps a third of the 2,700 million people inhabiting the earth would disappear, that is only 900 million.... I argued over this issue with Nehru. He is more pessimistic on this point than I am. (Nehru believed that an atomic war would kill all the people on earth.–*E.H.*) I told him that if one half of humanity would be destroyed, the other half would remain, but imperialism would be fully wiped out and there would only be socialism in the world, and that within half a century or a century the population would increase by even more than one half."



Mao Tse-tung said this in 1957 at the Moscow Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties. At the time there were people who thought that these words were uttered in the heat of a polemic, that they were just an impromptu and consequently were not to be taken seriously. But ten years have passed and we know that Maoist policy is fully consistent with them.

In Peking everything is based on the expectation of a third world war which will be waged by other powers. Moreover everything is being done to hasten its outbreak and thus make it easier for the "hawks" in the West to plunge the world into a catastrophe. Every event, every complication on the international scene is used for this purpose. When the leader of the US "hawks" Barry Goldwater announced his intention to run for president, a person who said that he should be referred to only as "a high-ranking member of the PRC government" in Peking said the following in a conversation with the editor-in-chief of the Austrian newspaper *Kurier*: "If I were in the USA I would vote for Goldwater. Goldwater would be good for the USA and the whole world because he would aggravate the domestic situation in the USA and greatly accelerate the process of development."

Development in what direction? Once again the reply is absolutely clear. In a year's time a new president will be elected in the USA. Will Peking once again pin its hopes on the success of one of the American arch-militarists?

But that's not all. Spengler predicted that as a result of a third world war the centre of human civilisation would shift from the "European-American" zone to a new region of the world. He did not say which one. Now the Maoists shout the same at all the crossroads and assert that the region from which their ideas emanate is destined to become the new centre of civilisation. They declare: "The war which will be waged by an overwhelming majority of humanity ... will become a bridge for humanity to enter a new historical epoch." This is

almost word for word what Spengler said. In their opinion 1,500 million lives is not an expensive price to pay for a bridge to Maoism. Spengler's pessimistic outlook for humanity's future never went so far as to imagine a picture of a flame-enveloped hungweiping world dying of nuclear radiation.

We spoke about political psychopathy becoming widespread in the period of the decay of bourgeois society. It is difficult to say where this epidemic has acquired the most acute forms in recent years—on the west coast of the Atlantic or on the shores of the Yellow Sea.

"Let us, finally, be sceptics," urged Spengler, "and cast off the old ideology. There are no reconciliations in real history. There is only one end to the eternal struggle—death. The death of the individual, the death of peoples, the death of a culture."

That is how a philosopher of the old society sees the future. And that is what is expected of him. The new society is all for life, for the life of the individual, for the life of the peoples, for the life of culture.

Like many other people, the author of this collection belongs to a generation which has seen more bloodshed than any of the preceding ones. Storms raged unabated throughout the world. When the old society had one of its regular attacks of convulsions, whole continents were drowned in blood. There were times when it seemed that the shadow of death shrouded everything and no one knew what would happen with the world tomorrow. Ensconced in their niches and crevices some bourgeois philosophers with what one might call sensual gratification predicted the end of human history. Actually, however, the inevitable and terrible process of the demise of their own class was gathering momentum. Pausing for breath after yet another carnage, the world somehow managed to move forward.

We know that this process is still underway. Undoubtedly, the capitalist system will writhe in fresh convulsions. Today, too, no reasonable person rules out the possibility of people waging just wars against aggression. Yet a third world war is not inevitable.



One of the most important conclusions which can be drawn from the history of international relations is that there is practical proof of the fact that peaceful coexistence is possible, and not that war is inevitable. This proof has been verified in the course of decades which have passed in the most complicated conditions and witnessed several extremely acute crises. Hitler has been proved to be wrong and so has Spengler. There was no world war in 1959, which was to have taken place according to Hitler's calendar, nor in 1964, in spite of Spengler's confident prediction.

But this does not mean, of course, that the threat of war no longer hangs over the world. Explosion-prone regions in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, in the Eastern Mediterranean, in Central Europe and Southern Africa have not disappeared, and new ones may appear tomorrow. Overseas imperialists are not slumbering and neither are the old and new colonialists, revanchists and neofascists. It is necessary to be on the look-out for all sorts of surprises. Optimists basking in the sun with folded arms come to a grievous end in our day and age.

One thing, however, cannot be disputed. Every decade of peaceful coexistence seriously reduces the chances of a third world war breaking out. That is why Soviet foreign policy plays such a gigantic role in contemporary history.

Pessimism has always been endemic in a class, exploiting society. "Enough has been written about the first two people on earth, someone should now try to write something about the last two," wrote the German philosopher Georg Lichtenberg back in 1789, at the beginning of the Great French Revolution. But optimists representing the advanced society are, as a rule, more powerful than the pessimists. Looking into the future and thinking about the unparalleled path that was covered in half a century, we are entitled to say, in spite of all contemporary Spenglers, that we have grounds for being optimists.

*1967*

## 4. REVANCHISTS AND MAOISTS[1]

The contemporary world is used to surprises. It is not given to amazement and hardly anything seems incredible to it. What yesterday was regarded as something quite out of the ordinary or a figment of a jaded imagination, is now viewed as normal and even mundane. But tomorrow it can again give way to something unexpected. History speeds forward without a glance at the patterns and canons of the moribund classes. It will not be confined to a specially prepared gilded framework and sweeps away all the scholastic barriers standing in its way. The world feels this in all spheres of life, and no respite is envisaged for the exhausted and the retrogrades. Not only scientific and technological progress, but also international political reality again and again drive into a blind alley all those who are not prepared to face the storms and contingencies of the transitional period.

That is why in our epoch it is necessary more than ever before to think ahead and do it boldly even if much of what today seems possible and probable may prove to be neither the one nor the other, but something totally different. Even if life with its unprecedented dynamism and breathtaking, unexpected turns introduces the necessary corrections into the calculations and views of our contemporaries, it is still their duty to observe, analyse and draw conclusions.

[1] This article was written in the year when the Right-wing CDU/CSU party was still in power in West Germany.–*Ed.*



There are several spots on the map of the world where abrupt changes can be expected. One of them is a city which today can be regarded as politically the most unnatural in the world. This city is Peking. Amazing turns have already taken place there, and now whatever surprises it may produce no one will be startled. Another spot is nine thousand kilometres away. It is Bonn.

What have they in common? At first glance, nothing. Moreover, it can be said that they are antipodes. Geographically and politically the FRG and China lie on the opposite sides of the world. Formally, they do not even know each other since they have no diplomatic relations. The FRG does not recognise China, and China is not on speaking terms with the FRG. One can hardly expect to find other countries with a greater degree of incompatibility, or so it seems. So what is there in common between the Peking leaders and Kiesinger, between the hungweipings and the Bundeswehr? But thinking along such lines is not dialectical.

No insurmountable wall divides Maoist China and West Germany. It is precisely their imaginary contrast that under certain conditions may bring them together. Quite possibly this will be one of the surprises which the world may witness in the last third of the century. One thing is clear. Contact between these two cities may set off a political explosion which could be detrimental to world peace.

So far it is too early to say when such contact will be established. It is meaningless to predict things, for a thinking individual is not given to crystal gazing. Yet there are grounds for believing that Peking and Bonn are beginning to gravitate towards each other, and not by accident.

Let's take Bonn's point of view. Here predictions are unnecessary. The question that worries Bonn today is clear to many people: what will happen if NATO falls apart?

From the day the FRG came into being the entire foreign policy of the forces rallied around Adenauer's

Right-wing party rested solely on the determination to participate in a coalition which one way or another, politically or militarily, would help them to cancel the results of the Second World War and wreak revenge. Right-wing politicians in West Germany based their calculations on the attainment of this goal. They had no other thoughts and plans. At the same time all revanchists, particularly the old nazis, categorically rejected the idea that the FRG could fight on its own against the socialist states. They maintained that Hitler's main blunder was that he went to war against the USSR without powerful allies.

Adenauer with his supporters took this into account in his post-war strategy. According to the first part of the new plan West Germany, relying on a direct alliance with the United States, would, in the shortest possible time, gain complete control over NATO in Europe, create under the NATO flag but on the basis of the Bundeswehr a powerful West German Wehrmacht, equip it with atomic missiles and then openly take its place on the international scene as the third thermonuclear giant. The second part, a purely political one, envisaged a methodical diplomatic game with the sole objective of provoking an armed conflict between the USA and the USSR and getting them to bleed each other white in lightning nuclear clashes. It was thought that in such a situation the Bundeswehr-led West German Wehrmacht could take the situation in hand and dictate the future of the world.

Such was the future as it was seen from the banks of the Rhine. Hence the confident, bustling activity of those politicians in recent years. The existence of such a plan whether we call it the Adenauer plan or the Heusinger plan is undoubtable. The West German revanchists worked on it with the same maniacal persistence as their predecessors had worked on the Schlieffen plan and Case Barbarossa. Now, however, this scheme hangs in the air. The NATO edifice is quaking and this means that the revanchists in the FRG, whether they like it or not, have to sit down and think again, think as they never imagined they would have to.



Once again history has outwitted the German militarists. Things took a totally different turn. Their new army has been created, their influence in NATO European headquarters is assured, their armaments already surpass those of Hitler's Wehrmacht. But the coalition which formed the basis of their entire strategy and lacking which they are hamstrung, is gripped by a crisis and sooner or later may begin to disintegrate.

France has already turned her back on NATO. Paris, which pursues an independent policy, does not intend to abet the revenge-mongers. Britain continues to be a member of NATO, but has no confidence in itself. Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway and Turkey are biding time but they are also displaying an inclination to reject NATO's aggressive policy. There is every indication that Western Europe is averse to following the lead of rightist Bonn. The FRG has no true, fully reliable allies on the European continent.

All that the revanchists have left is their alliance with the USA, without which Bonn will be worth nothing today. So long as this alliance lasts NATO will remain alive and the old Adenauer-Heusinger plan may basically remain in force. So far the revanchists continue to base their strategy on the Bonn-Washington axis. But at present they have to ascertain whether even this axis is durable. On the Rhine they are no longer absolutely sure of the possibility of placing the same hopes on the USA that in their time encouraged Adenauer to join NATO.

This issue, although little is said about it, is turning into a crucial factor of the policy pursued by the Bonn reactionaries. And not only because so far the Bundeswehr has been unable to get the atomic bomb, the main thing which it expected to get. For Bonn the problem is a much broader one. When the revanchists formed an alliance with America, they relied on the "brilliant" conception formulated by the ex-Hitlerite generals in the Bundeswehr headquarters. They calculated to shift the main burden of the planned war on the USA thus enabling the FRG to play a double game until the last moment. None of the more wary revanchists seriously intended to

risk West Germany's complete destruction which would be inevitable in the event of its participation in an aggressive nuclear war. It turned out, however, that the US war plan provided for the exact opposite. In keeping with a Pentagon conception worked out back in the fifties, West Germany would be sacrificed without any qualms in the event of war, and the Bundeswehr would have to play the role of a doomed shock army with orders to hold the European bridgehead for the Americans for a few weeks or at least for a few days.

Of course, Bonn knew all about these plans of the Pentagon. But as always the German militarists believed that in the future, too, they would be able to outsmart their partners. Since then, however, the actual state of affairs has not changed: the plans of the US generals remain in force, and, most importantly, it is they who have the final say in NATO's overseas headquarters. The Bonn revanchists are now forced to sit back and think hard: what can the alliance with the US bring West Germany when the critical moment arrives?

Moreover, they are not at all confident that this alliance will not fall apart even in peace-time. The possibility of a revival of Roosevelt's foreign policy conceptions in the USA, or of the emergence on the Washington scene of relatively moderate leaders, has always troubled the German revanchists. Now it is a source of even greater anxiety. West Germany is keeping a close watch over the changes in US public opinion brought about by the interminable failures in US policy which may seriously alter the international climate, and not in Bonn's favour. They may pave the way for resolving a range of other important problems as, for example, the limitation of nuclear armaments and the shift to disarmament. Under pressure from world public opinion it will become possible to take fresh steps to ensure peace and progress in Europe and other parts of the world as well. The positions of the "hawks" will weaken everywhere and the cold war atmosphere will soften. In what sort of a situation will NATO find itself, and how will such a detente affect the US-West German military alliance?



All this, needless to say, remains largely undecided; everything depends on the course of events which no one, least of all the German revanchists, can foretell. On their part they are continuing to make every effort to consolidate the alliance with the USA, prevent the collapse of NATO and, in the meanwhile, increase their own armaments. Yet these people are not blind. They cannot be unaware of the fact that they are being threatened with isolation from many sides.

Maoist China has already fallen into such isolation in Asia.

By the latter half of the sixties it became absolutely clear that Peking's foreign policy proved to be barren in the main. It has sustained a setback which not many of the other major powers had experienced in our day.

The most important plans conceived in Peking went up in smoke. The Maoists neither strengthened their positions in the Pacific nor established their hegemony in East and Southeast Asia as they had planned to do. Most of their "grandiose" operations came to grief.

The attempt to Maoise Indonesia and thus break through to the Indian Ocean in a single sweeping drive and encircle the backward countries of this region, ended in complete fiasco. It merely brought the Indonesian reaction to power. Direct interference in the affairs of a number of other Asian states also ended in a resounding failure. The armed conflict with India did not yield the desired results and struck a blow at China's prestige; the intrigues in the Arab states yielded no results and no steps were taken to form the Peking-Karachi and Peking-Tokyo axes which were planned by Chinese diplomacy. The idea to create a large external ring, a sort of a Pan-Asian bloc around China and thus turn the Maoist state into a new super-power proved to be illusory.

Having strained their relations with the Soviet Union the Peking leaders have been unable to find anything to compensate their break with the socialist camp. They have no powerful allies and, judging by everything, the future is pregnant with fresh setbacks. If Peking fails to find a new, reliable mainstay on one or another conti-

nent and new partners for its game, Chinese nationalistic diplomacy will be done for sooner or later.

Isolated, all on its own, and, on top of everything, rent by internal contradictions, Maoist China cannot aspire to a leading role in world politics however hard the Peking leaders may want. It lacks the strength for this. All alone it cannot carry on a major international intrigue in order to attain its objectives; it cannot create serious threats on the flanks or in the rear of one or another power or group of powers, and cover up its offensive on one continent with concerted actions on another.

Such is the situation in which the Maoists now find themselves. Having lost so much, they have gained almost nothing and have only themselves to blame for being quarantined. Without a strong partner, either in Asia or in Europe, they cannot afford to pursue their anti-Soviet policy.

Everything tallies. The reactionaries in Bonn for whom revanchism has become an obsession have nothing with which to replace the tottering NATO coalition, except by establishing closer relations with Maoist China. On their part the Peking politicians who have lost their bearings in the maze of their great-power chauvinistic plans have nothing to offset the failure of their intention to establish a pan-Asian Reich except by striking a deal with Bonn.

Our contemporary is puzzled. Such a deal, as we have already noted, seems unnatural. On the one hand, there are the politicians of the most aggressive bourgeoisie in Europe, the direct heirs of nazism and socialism's deadly enemies; on the other, there are the extreme pseudo-leftists, almost anarcho-communists who believe that capitalism should be destroyed by means of a world war. In Asia no state is more leftist than Maoist China. These are the facts. But there is nothing inexplicable, nothing unrealistic in the mutual attraction of these seemingly opposite forces. Such marriages of convenience are a typical feature of our epoch and it is about time we got used to them.



In May 1942, at the height of the Second World War, the question of whether nazi Germany could betray the racial principles of national-socialism and strike a deal with a yellow race in the person of Japan was raised in Hitler's headquarters by his closest associates. Hitler said: "The essential thing now is to win—and to that end we are quite ready to make an alliance with the Devil himself."

Such was the attitude of the nazi demi-god. Is this question presented differently by the revanchists and the neonazis in the NDP? Evidently not. And here are facts proving this.

The *Augsburger Allgemeine*, a newspaper close to the Bavarian party of Franz Josef Strauss, wrote: "Peking's chargé d'affaires in Paris reported that Peking was prepared in the course of the development of trade relations with the FRG to accept the Hallstein Doctrine, and, consequently, sever relations with the GDR, recognise the FRG as the sole German state and regard the GDR as a West German Taiwan."

Soon after, Strauss, the leader of the Right-wing revanchists in the FRG, made an unexpected trip to the Far East. That he did not go as a tourist was evident from the fact that he was accompanied by his closest associates. The guest from Bonn visited several cities, including Hongkong, where he talked with different people, and upon returning to West Germany he made the sensational announcement in Munich that Peking could contribute to the reunification of Germany.

Some time later, addressing a meeting of the revanchist Union of Exiles, Strauss expressing himself in a manner typical of West German politicians added: "If things have reached a stage when China challenges the legitimacy of Soviet claims to alter the map of Europe by partitioning Germany, then German (Bonn—*E.H.*) policy should pay attention to this." He did not say why he drew such a conclusion.

Although the leader of the revanchists made the reservation that Bonn should not irritate America by extending official recognition to China, he clearly indicated that

there was a possibility of the FRG pursuing an active policy with regard to Peking. In his book *Challenge and Response: A Programme for Europe* Strauss mentioned though somewhat vaguely that the FRG should carefully study the situation in the Far East in connection with the appearance of a "giant in Asia" with a "growing nuclear potential". One thing is particularly notable. Strauss, as though in passing, underscored that the entire problem was "more or less beyond the field of vision of the average man", in other words, that for the time being it should be taken up only by the initiated.

Strauss is viewed as the head of the future Right-wing government in the FRG which will enjoy the support not only of the clericals in the CDU and the Bundeswehr brass, but also of the neonazis in the NDP. In statements made after his tour of the Far East he outlined the policy he would pursue upon becoming head of government. He intimated that if France and the USA failed to live up to Bonn's expectations, then he would implement Plan No. 3 which he had in reserve.

There is no need to explain why Strauss needs allies. In November 1956, during the counter-revolutionary mutiny in Hungary, he made the following statement in his capacity of Minister of Defence: "We are living in a technological age when the combined forces of our allies are strong enough to wipe the Soviet Union off the face of the earth." Today Strauss is undoubtedly the most influential figure in West German military and monopoly circles. It is obvious that this man has at least one thing in common with Hitler. He, too, will not hesitate to make an alliance with the devil himself. And in this respect he is not alone in the FRG.

There are grounds for saying that very similar foreign policy designs are already maturing in the heads of the neo-fascist leaders. An extremely indicative feature in this respect is that their party, the NDP, sharply opposes West Germany's current pro-American and pro-NATO course. Neofascists declare that this policy is prospectless and that in due time it will be replaced by a new foreign policy. What sort of a policy are they talking about?



In a conversation with a correspondent of the Hamburg journal *Der Spiegel* in November 1966, NDP chief Otto Hess said: "We believe that in its old form and its old substance the NATO bloc has been liquidated by de Gaulle and that we should take advantage of the breach thus formed to embark on a new course." He added that first of all it was necessary to build up a community of interests with France. He did not say what would have to be done if France refused to strike a deal with the neonazis. As a matter of fact he left even more things unsaid than Strauss did. Still, it is clear that both of them had one and the same thought: let's try the first, and if it does not work out, well we'll see then.... It should be borne in mind that all these people studied Hitler's diplomacy.

There are other, more direct indications of this. In September 1966, shortly after the beginning of the "cultural revolution" and rampant anti-Soviet demonstrations in Peking, the notorious fascist sheet *Deutsche Nationalzeitung und Soldatenzeitung*, published in Munich, carried an article under the intriguing title "Peking-Moscow-Bonn". It excitedly explained "why we in the FRG have no reason to be indignant over the demonstrations in front of the Soviet embassy and 'anti-revisionism' in China".

Insisting the Bonn should take advantage of the "remarkably favourable political constellation" the newspaper wrote that China's proposals to West Germany "by far surpass all that we have accepted in negotiations with the Eastern bloc. For an exchange of trade missions China was prepared to recognise the Berlin clause (Bonn's demand that West Berlin should be regarded as a part of the FRG–*E.H.*), and in the event of diplomatic recognition it would even agree to revise its relations with the GDR.... In the course of official talks with German experts on the East, Peking let it indirectly be understood that it attaches little significance to an ideological alliance with the GDR (which has since been disrupted)". Adding that Peking's attitude to the Berlin wall, i.e., to the GDR Government's measures to safeguard its sovereignty "is

no better than our own", the neonazi newspaper joyously exclaimed: "Where in the world would such a proposal ever fall into our lap?"

For the benefit of the uninitiated readers the paper promptly explained that in general there was no reason to fear the so-called cultural revolution, for allegedly it wrecks only "petrified traditions and the foolishness of superstition" and not the old culture, and that "when this happens some China-ware is bound to be broken". This is a clear hint that something of the kind had taken place in nazi Germany and consequently there was nothing bad in that. The main thing, however, the paper emphasised, was that in China they were trying to knock hatred for the USSR into the heads of the masses.

China's consent to the inclusion of West Berlin in the FRG and the subsequent occupation of the German Democratic Republic by West Germany, are the conditions which the neonazis overtly advance as the basis for building the Bonn-Peking axis. It is not surprising that they jubilantly welcomed a report to the effect that Peking regards the borders along the Oder and the Neisse as illegal. It will not be surprising if the assertions made by the French newspaper *Paris-Jour* that the relations between China and the FRG have reached a stage at which the Peking leaders have direct contacts even with the NDP will prove to be correct.

Whatever the case the German revanchists certainly see nothing fantastic or reprehensible in coming to terms with Maoist China. From their point of view this is a natural diplomatic game and one that is absolutely vital to them. Are their reports about the Maoists' proposals to Bonn trustworthy? Is it conceivable that Peking is actually conducting such an unprincipled foreign policy designed to undermine the socialist system?

Those refusing to believe this commit an unforgivable error. Some politicians have never been averse to dealing with the devil.

In August 1967 the well-informed French journalist Geneviève Tabouis reported that Peking had issued a top-secret circular to the leaders of pro-Chinese organisations



in Europe. It was a reply to the query by Mao's followers who were alarmed by China's "flirtation with Bonn". The circular pointed out that "Marxists-Leninists should not ignore reactionary regimes if these regimes were the enemies of their enemies". It went on to say that West Germany should be regarded as "an effective ally of China in the struggle against such a conspiracy as the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", and underscored that the FRG was helping China to "expose the myth about peace".

In effect the authors of the circular confirmed what Hitler had said in his time—an alliance with the devil himself if the devil gives something in return. There is no reason for astonishment. It is impossible to expect anything else from people for whom a great-power chauvinistic policy is more important than communism.

What is behind the Chinese leaders' desire to seek closer relations with reactionary circles in any part of the world? Ideological doubts, or may be remorse? But since we are talking about Chinese nationalists this question is irrelevant. People whose main occupation is to indulge in imperial dreams have no ideological or moral brakes. And there is no need to invent them.

Something totally different is invented. The fact is that Peking has already prepared a special pseudo-Marxist theory in order "ideologically" to justify the deal with the European revanchists. It is the so-called theory of intermediate zones which was made known already in the beginning of 1964. According to this theory China has to strengthen its contacts not only with the revolutionary peoples of the Asian, African and Latin American countries but also with those capitalist states over which the USA is trying to establish control. The FRG is included in the list. According to the Peking theoreticians countries comprising this so-called intermediate zone "are of a dual nature: their ruling classes exploit and suppress others while being themselves subject to US control, interference and oppression. Therefore they endeavour by every means to get rid of American control. In this sense they have a point of contact with the socialist countries and the peo-

ples of all countries". So, it turns out that theoretically and ideologically "contacts", i.e. a projected alliance with the revanchists and neonazis, is precisely what is needed.

It can be added that the West German fascists promptly responded to Peking overtures. When the news about the newly-invented theory of "intermediate zones" reached the West, the *Deutsche Nationalzeitung und Soldatenzeitung* wrote with malicious cynicism: "This is an unusual event for us: we are ranked not among the imperialists but among the peace-loving part of the world." Then followed another conclusion: "Overpopulated China can enlarge its territory only at the expense of regions under the Russian flag." A common language was found.

But one has to be a realist. It will be wrong to draw hasty conclusions and believe that the Maoist Peking-revanchist Bonn axis will be formed in the immediate future. To be sure this is a question which requires further scrutiny: a short article cannot replace a detailed analysis. Life will check Strauss' calculations, just as it has repeatedly checked and overturned the plans of his forerunners. In any case one thing is definite, namely, that the German revanchists will hardly wager on a Chinese card so long as they hold the American card.

Yet facts are facts. Secret contacts between Bonn and Peking are continuing. In the summer of 1967 the *New York Times* directly reported about secret negotiations between Chinese and German representatives in Bern. It is important to note that the information was received from the Americans, a sign that the FRG's long-standing allies were alarmed. A denial issued by the Foreign Ministry in Bonn convinced no one.

It is also common knowledge that though China and the FRG have no diplomatic relations with each other and no trade agreement, their economic contacts are steadily expanding, and China's trade with West Germany has surpassed the level of its trade with Britain and France with whom it has diplomatic relations. In 1966 China's trade turnover with the FRG was three times higher than in 1964, and in 1967 exceeded the sum of one thousand



million marks. West Germany has become China's major European supplier.

A noteworthy fact is that the bulk of West Germany's assistance to China is channelled into the development of its armaments industry, including the production of mass annihilation weapons. It was reported in the autumn of 1966 that a large group of West German specialists went to China to help it build missiles with a 650-kilometre operational range. Chinese affairs were examined at a special meeting of the Eastern Committee of the union of FRG industrialists. Talks were held on West Germany assisting the PRC to build a steel-rolling mill with an annual capacity of three million tons.

China's trade with West Germany is continuing to expand virtually from month to month. But that is not the most important thing.

In May 1967 the ambassadors of the Adenauer Government accredited in the capitals of the Far Eastern and Southeast Asian countries held a conference in Tokyo. According to the West German press it was arranged for the purpose of formulating a "new conception of Bonn's active Asian policy". The substance of this conception was not disclosed. But two months later the then Deputy Foreign Minister of the FRG declared: "We can establish diplomatic relations with Peking at any time." And when at the end of November 1967 Kiesinger appeared in Asia in person, the press reported that he would also have confidential talks with Chinese diplomats in Colombo, Rawalpindi and Karachi.

It would be expedient to name the man who headed the East Asia sector of the FRG Foreign Ministry at the time. A person with a sinister background, he was none other than Hilmar Bassler, former nazi propaganda chief in East Asia, a veteran member of the Nazi party and a confidential agent of the SS security headquarters. Bassler co-operates with two other former nazi specialists in East Asian affairs, the FRG ambassador to Japan Krapf, formerly of the SS, and Klaus Mehnert, a one-time Goebbels plenipotentiary in the Far East who is now a professor. He is the same Hitlerite who in 1942, following Richard

Sorge's arrest in Japan, was posted as correspondent for the *Frankfurter Zeitung* in East Asia with the approval of the Gestapo.

The old trio Bassler-Krapf-Mehnert, which played a considerable role in Ribbentrop's ministry, is now no less influential in a Bonn institution which is its direct continuation. Mehnert frequently performs secret missions in countries close to China, evidently fulfilling diverse delicate errands for Bonn. Here is what this pupil of Goebbels declared in a speech on February 4, 1966 at the Overseas Club in Hamburg: "There is no doubt that in the situation in which the Chinese find themselves today ... it is very important for them to negotiate a deal, including an exchange of experts and the like, with the capitalist world with the exception of the United States. They are calculating enough to include the FRG among the states with whom they would be able to do this."

What Mehnert speaks about is being considered and carried into life in Bonn's diplomatic institution by Bassler and Krapf. It is with such people who had once, on Hitler's instructions, arranged deals with other "devils" in Asia that Peking's diplomatic emissaries are now secretly negotiating.

It is hard to predict the results of the contacts between the German revanchists and the Maoists. But it is necessary to keep a vigilant eye on the leaps and zigzags in this sector of world politics. In our day it is not too far from the Rhine to the Yangtse. Would-be führers and proponents of "sinicised" Marxism see eye to eye on certain matters. Experience and dialectics confirm that such opposites come together. One shouldn't think that it would be impossible for the Chinese nationalists to draw closer to the revenge-mongers, under one pretext or another, to the same people whose political predecessors had once invented the "yellow menace" concept.

*1968*

## 5. A REPLY TO A MAOIST AND A REPLY TO A REVANCHIST

I have learned that the February 8, 1968 issue of the Peking *Jenmin jihpao* carried an article by Kuo Hung of Futan University in Shanghai. It was a reply to an article which I wrote after completing a trip to the Pamirs. Published in the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* five months ago, it dealt with Peking's foreign policy.

Kuo Hung does not like my article. He calls me a "cricket", an "autumn fly", a "nonentity fiercely hating China which has become a centre of world revolution" and a variety of other names. He declares that what I have written is "arch-reactionary", and even warns me that I'm indulging in "death-bed blather". "Let the crickets weep plaintively in the dreary autumn," he writes. "The days of all pests in the world are numbered." Well, his style is his own business.

It isn't his style that matters, however, but the paper's assertion that I "attack" China and the Chinese people. And this, needless to say, is a lie.

What I wrote was not about the Chinese people, but about the nationalists who have turned against them, not about the Chinese Communists, but about those who want to strangle the Chinese Communist Party, not about the Marxist-Leninists in the PRC, but about a group which tries to replace the socialist system in China with the dictatorship of an autocratic military group.

For only the brains of individuals making up this group, people who have divorced themselves from com-

munism, can conceive such great-power chauvinistic ideas of world domination, of the need of another world war to serve as a "bridge" to the future, of the "expediency" of wiping out one half of humanity. Nations, any nation for that matter, cannot have such ideas and theories.

Chinese nationalism is definitely of interest to scholars studying certain forms of political psychopathy. But Peking's ravings have nothing in common with China's interests and the policy of socialism. They are profitable only to one group of people outside China–the imperialists of the extreme, "rabid" wing who also favour a third world war and the extermination of hundreds of millions of people, as well as any policy which handicaps unity of action of the socialist camp. Today no one is more delighted with the anti-Soviet acts of the Maoists than the "hawks" in the USA and the neonazis in the FRG. And the Chinese people are not to be implicated.

I will not call the author of the *Jenmin jihpao* article a fly, midge, mosquito or any other entomological name. To do so would be impolite. I'm inclined to think that Kuo Hung could be one of those unfortunate members of the university intelligentsia in China who are compelled to write what they do not think and say what they do not believe.

We know that the life of such people in present-day China is extremely onerous and that in many cases they deserve sincere compassion for having to humiliate themselves in public. Maybe that explains their wild style of writing. I have nothing against Kuo Hung.

We also know that the millennia-long history of China will not end in the sixties of the twentieth century. And in spite of everything all of us would like to believe that the dark period in the life of that great country will soon be over.

There has never been, nor will there ever be, anyone in the USSR unfavourably disposed towards the Chinese people.

At all times big and small Talleyrands were displeased when their innermost ambitions were discussed. Evidently this applies to people who would like to be the Talleyrands of our time. My "Bonn-Peking?" articles carried by *Literaturnaya Gazeta* have been resolutely condemned in both Bonn and Peking. Both capitals were outraged that someone had the audacity to expose the top-secret "brilliant" and "demonic" idea of a deal between the revanchists in Europe and the Maoists in Asia. As distinct from fiction the "demonic" in politics cannot suffer coding, for then all that will remain of "demonism" will be filth, blood and insanity.



They are particularly irritated on the Rhine. Among the numerous reviews in the West German press about the "Bonn-Peking?" articles I should like to mention the views expressed by the Stuttgart newspaper *Christ und Welt* which were broadcast by the Deutsche Welle radio station in Köln. It is not a secret that 30 per cent of this paper's shares are owned by Eugen Gerstenmaier, president of the Bundestag[1] and one of the leaders of the ruling CDU party. The article in the West German paper is entitled "Moscow Sees the Yellow Menace Everywhere", and I would not have responded to it if not for the following circumstances.

In the first place the mouthpiece of the Bundestag president denies nothing. The author of the reply rambles on and on but is, in fact, as mute as an oyster.

He does not deny the fact that talks are in progress between Bonn and Peking.

He does not deny the fact that the idea of an alliance with the PRC is already one of the alternative plans of the top revanchist Strauss, and the chief of the neonazis von Thadden.

He does not deny the fact that a very important backstage role in all these matters is played by the former Hitlerite diplomats who had once worked for Ribbentrop and the Gestapo in East Asia. Obviously there is nothing to deny, and it is no longer possible to hush things up.

So, what about facts, meine Herren from *Christ und Welt*, what do Christian Democrats think about them? Why do you pass over in complete silence the projected

[1] Retired in 1968.–*Ed.*

deal with functionaries some of whom favour a nuclear war, an explosion of the world civilisation and the extermination of one half of mankind?

It is common knowledge that Herr Gerstenmaier, formerly a nazi and storm trooper, is one of the most avowed ultra-Right and anti-Soviet dignitaries of the Lutheran church in the FRG and a member of its synod. He could have referred to the name of his teacher Luther to justify the policy of a rapprochement between Christians and Maoists. Cursing the insurgent German peasants in the 16th century, Luther urged the princes and landowners to stop at nothing for the sake of exterminating the "torches of hell" and "servants of the devil". Let those who can, he said, strangle and stab, secretly or overtly and remember that nothing is more venomous, harmful and devilish than a mutineer.

This is theology and also politics. Possibly its principles still inspire the leaders of the German reactionary bourgeoisie, and for the sake of attaining such objectives they are prepared today, too, to do everything "secretly or overtly".

Class tastes differ, and there is no use arguing over them. It is an open secret that Bonn and Peking are irresistibly drawn to one another. But it is necessary to underline the following.

Referring to my articles Herr Gerstenmaier's newspaper speaks ironically about a mythical "age-old Russian fear of the yellow menace". Now this is no longer theology. Luther ordered his disciples to strangle, but not to lie.

Any high school pupil who has studied modern history knows the names of those who coined the phrase about the yellow menace. When a popular uprising against foreign imperialists broke out in China in 1900 and the great powers dispatched an international punitive corps to crush it, it was placed under the command of German Field Marshal Count Alfred von Waldersee at the personal request of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Urging a merciless struggle against the "yellow menace", which in the person of the Mongol race allegedly threatened the white civilisation, the Kaiser sang forth the slogan: "Peoples of Europe, guard your sacred possessions!" On July 27, 1900 he delivered a vehement speech to the German troops departing for China.



"Spare nobody. Take no prisoners," he thundered. "Let those who fall into your hands become your prey. Just as the Huns led by their king Attila glorified their name a thousand years ago ... so you should imprint the word 'German' in China for a thousand years to come, and in such a way that will make every Chinaman for ever forego the wish to as much as look askance at a German."

One should think that there are people in Peking who have not forgotten these words and all that followed. The German mercenaries lived up to their Kaiser's expectations. In the ensuing months the German papers were full of so-called Hun letters in which the soldiers of the German punitive forces openly boasted about the atrocities to which they had subjected the Chinese, both men and women. This was decades ago. There were no SS men then. But their forerunners were already glorying in their ability to kill and plunder defenceless people of another race and nationality.

No, it was not in Russia that the expression "yellow menace" originated. It was coined by those whose direct heirs are currently reviving the brown menace in their own country.

*1968*

## 6. BETRAYAL

It took the world a long time to calm down after the March 1969 events on the Soviet-Chinese border. Both friend and foe of the USSR were staggered. The Soviet people are still burning with indescribable wrath, experiencing a feeling as though an attempt had been made to stab them in the back. Rarely had their anger blazed so intensely as after the attack on Damansky Island.

But wrath alone, however just, is not enough. It is necessary to take a closer look at what is actually taking place. It may well happen that not only the present generation will have to deal with the problems that worry all of us today. So far many people have not fully grasped the meaning of the turn in Chinese foreign policy. It is not simply that the Peking leaders, letting the fumes of chauvinism go to their heads, have discarded communism. Such things happened before to people of this sort. At the moment we should like to note something else. From the *international* point of view Mao's act has no precedent in history.

His policy should be examined not only in the light of the current moves and statements of the Maoists, but also from the standpoint of their long-term schemes. This is very important.

What is the essence of the matter?

In the course of the preceding five decades all anti-Soviet politicians throughout the world were obsessed with the idea of encircling the USSR. This obsession seized them the day the socialist state came into existence. The imperialists wanted to take it into an "iron ring", invest it



from the west and east and, if possible, also from the south and north. They thought that when the ring would close the USSR would cease to exist. As simple as that.

This was the objective of the policy the West pursued for decades. The Soviet Union was never left in peace. One attempt at encirclement followed another, and each time the USSR had to wage a life-and-death struggle. All of us of the older generation remember what it all meant. None of us have been left unscarred by the imperialist policy of encirclement.

Churchill was the first to map the encirclement of the Soviet Republic. Forming a coalition of 14 capitalist states and attaching the armies of the Russian whiteguards to it, he welded the anti-Soviet forces into a chain which extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea and from the Arctic to the Pacific Ocean. The interventionists were confident that as the chain tightened it would strangle Moscow. It took the young Soviet Republic three years to sunder it. But that was only the beginning.

The second plan of encirclement of the USSR was drafted fifteen years later by Hitler under the signboard of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo anti-Comintern pact. Once again preparations were made for attacking the Soviet Union from the west and east, and if possible, also from the north and south. Vast air and land forces were assembled for the purpose, and the plan was foiled only thanks to the unsurpassed heroism of the Soviet people. But that, too, did not put an end to the policy of encirclement.

The third project of the same ring was drawn up after the Second World War by Dulles. Now it was a question of enveloping the entire socialist community and not just the USSR. The NATO-CENTO-SEATO chain of anti-communist blocs created by Dulles was simply an improved, highly complex system of encirclement of the USSR and other socialist countries. This time the participants were armed with atomic weapons. Billions of dollars were spent on this cordon which passed through Europe, America and Asia. Excitement in the entire capitalist world rose to fever pitch. But today we know that the third attempt to encircle the USSR likewise failed. Now, twenty

years after the founding of NATO, the Dulles plan is called into question.

Dulles' anti-communist blocs are still operating, whipping up tensions and hampering peaceful coexistence. But the links in the chain are beginning to give way and in the latter half of the sixties it became possible to talk about a crisis of the entire policy of encirclement.

It was at this juncture that the Peking politicians joined the game in pursuit of an absolutely obvious objective.

There should be a clear understanding of why China has acquired such exceptional importance for the anti-socialist strategy of the imperialists, and moreover, for the most rabid of them. Only then will it be possible to understand the policy of Peking, too.

Let's glance at the edifice of the "global" anti-Soviet coalition which was knocked together at the end of the forties. The first thing that strikes the eye are the cracks and holes that pockmark its façade. The state of this coalition hardly makes it fit for the task of surrounding the socialist countries, as Dulles had hoped it would.

France, one of the major founding states of NATO in Europe, has withdrawn from the bloc's military organisation. Britain, Italy, the Benelux, Greece,[1] Turkey, Norway and Denmark remain in it. But no one can predict the stand one or another of them will adopt several years hence. Anti-NATO and neutralist sentiments are growing even in West European bourgeois circles. At present the FRG alone is still regarded as NATO's reliable mainstay. The bloc's unity can no longer be fully guaranteed. On the other side of the Atlantic Canada has announced the "de-escalation" of her military participation in NATO.

The old anti-Soviet coalition in Asia is experiencing even greater difficulties. CENTO which was founded by the USA and Britain and initially included Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Pakistan is gradually fading out of the picture in the Middle East. SEATO is growing sickly in Southeast

[1] In 1974, Greece, too, dropped out of the bloc's military organisation.–*Ed.*



Asia. The defeat of the USA in Vietnam and Britain's withdrawal from the zone "east of the Suez" announced by the Labourites are having an impact on the countries in that part of the world. The Philippines has officially announced that it wants to revise its agreements with the USA. Even Japan can no longer be considered a fully reliable base of the USA: the Japanese people have absolutely no wish to plunge headlong into an abyss for the sake of the Americans, and state their attitude in fairly clear terms to the Japanese government. The USA tries to prop up its old blocs and positions in Asia by concluding a deal with Australia. But these calculations, too, can easily become doubtful speculations at any time. Dulles' Asian chain, to which he assigned such an important place in his encirclement plans, is on the verge of falling apart.

As we know the old anti-socialist coalition with all its links and bastions in the west, east, north and south continues to exist. In terms of the amount of weapons at its disposal it is now much more powerful than before. But politically, and, consequently, strategically it has been undermined. Its leaders urgently need a new and reliable partner, first and foremost in Asia, which many of them regard as the key to the encirclement of the USSR.

These considerations have deep roots. German militarists still believe that one of the main causes of their defeat in the Second World War was that there was no second front against the USSR in the Far East. Japan is accused of failing to exploit the possibility of attacking the Soviet Union in the rear and thus forcing it to divide its forces at the decisive moment.

It is this task which the more adventuristic anti-Soviet strategists in the West want to impose upon Maoist China. Quite naturally NATO is not devoid of sober-minded bourgeois politicians and military leaders who can, to a certain extent, realistically evaluate the correlation of forces and the outcome of such ventures. But the more vicious of the "hawks", the contemporary disciples of Hitler and Dulles have other ideas and plans. In their opinion, the encirclement of the USSR and the world socialist system is almost inconceivable without China. A broad sec-

ond front against the socialist community can be created, they maintain, only if China becomes a part of it.

Recently we quoted a statement by the leader of the German revanchists Strauss in which he spoke about coincidence of interests of the FRG and China. Prior to that, however, the Hamburg journal *Neue Politik* published an article headlined "China and We" whose author Wolf Schenke, former resident of the Hitlerite intelligence in China, gave a more candid account of the plans harboured by the extremists in Bonn.

"The future of our people, that is of our children and grandchildren," wrote the seasoned nazi, "depends to a much greater extent on what is taking place in China, than on the events occurring in the countries of our neighbours–the French, British and Poles, or in the more distant ones–that of the Russians or Americans. . . . A United Europe (the "supra-national" state whose establishment under the aegis of the FRG is projected by the revanchists –*E.H.*) which ought to be formed is not an enemy but a partner of China. . . . Of all the great powers China alone is vitally interested in Germany's reunification (read: the absorption of the GDR by the revanchists–*E.H.*). It is not in the least interested in the existence of two Germanys which neutralise each other in their contradictions and thus fully cancel the German strength in the play of strength in world politics."[1]

Maoist China as the main ally of "German strength in international politics"–that is how the future appears to the extreme German revanchists of the Strauss type and those standing even more to the right and also to some of the Bundeswehr generals who have lost their heads, those new Keitels and Guderians who were always in plenty but on the opposite bank of the Elbe. There is no doubt whatsoever that they are already obsessed with the idea of "two fronts" against the USSR. But only Peking can give them the key to the fourth plan for encircling the Soviet Union.

For decades the Soviet Union strained every nerve and fibre, suffered terrible privations and sacrificed millions

[1] *Neue Politik*, Hamburg, 25. 5. 1968, S. 3.



of lives in order to counter the imperialist policy of encirclement and aggression. Now, when the old strategy is moving up a blind alley, the new plan for encircling the socialist community devised by the most rabid imperialists envisages Mao Tse-tung's participation. Judging by his moves and diplomatic hints, addressed, for example, to Bonn and promptly caught up by Strauss and his neo-nazis, judging by the clearly demonstrative attack on the Soviet island of Damansky, Peking would indeed be prepared to participate in furbishing the old projects of Churchill, Hitler and Dulles but on certain conditions and for a certain price.

Will this amount merely to a break with Marxism? Of course not. A betrayal of this sort transcends the limits of ideology.

Does history know of similar cases? Can it be asserted that the Maoists are doing what others had done before them, that they are neither the first nor the last?

Let's look back upon things past and check.

True enough there are no few examples of one state betraying another in the chronicles of the world. They can be found in all history books. Such acts of betrayal were carried out by politicians of the old society at all times–in the slave-owning, feudal and capitalist eras. To enter into an alliance with a country and then betray it was in the ordinary run of things.

On record in ancient history is aristocratic Sparta's refusal, on the grounds of holding festive games, to come to the assistance of the Athenians who were attacked by Persian hordes. But the Spartans did not strike a deal with the Persians, nor did they strike the Athenians in the back.

In the 15th and 16th centuries the feudal armies of the German landsknechts passed from one side to another without the least compunction. But those were mercenaries and they served the highest bidder.

During the Napoleonic wars Prussia systematically betrayed its allies. In 1805 it was with Russia and Austria and against France, by the end of the year it had changed sides; in 1806 it joined with the anti-French coalition, in

1807 it was back in the French camp, in 1812 it was with the French against Russia, and then it went over to the side of Russia and the other powers which were fighting against France. Betrayal followed betrayal. But they were committed by Friedrich Wilhelm III, a despot notorious for his cowardice, who kept changing sides fearing for the safety of his throne.

In the contemporary period German bourgeois historians cannot forgive Italy for taking the side of the Entente in the First World War. But then it was the entire Italian nation which demanded the dissoluiton of the alliance with the Kaiser and Italy's old enslaver–Austria.

Finally, we could recall the latest case of abominable perfidy: nazi Germany's attack on the Soviet Union 22 months after the conclusion of a non-aggression pact. But those were fascists, socialism's deadliest enemies. By launching the surprise attack, they merely acted as fascists.

We could trace history from ancient to modern times and find no example of the kind of betrayal which the imperialists of the extreme wing intend to propose to the Maoists. For thousands of years the perfidy of the slave-owning, feudal and capitalist politicians was rooted in their total lack of principles, cowardliness, predaciousness, venality and enviousness. There are no words in the language of ethics to characterise the "communists" who betray the family of socialist nations.

If such a betrayal comes to pass, it will be the most terrible one in history. And what for? What do the Maoists, who are prepared to betray socialism and go over to the side of the enemy, hope to attain? How do they expect to benefit by such an act?

The answer is obvious. Today almost everybody is aware that Peking's foreign policy is secretly designed to create a sort of a Maoist sphere of influence in Asia which will extend from the Pacific Ocean almost as far as the Black Sea. It is common knowledge that the extremists in Peking would have liked to include into this sphere of influence not only the Soviet regions in Asia, the Mongolian People's Republic, Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos,



Burma and Indonesia but at some later time even India, the Arab East and other territories. According to their plans, some countries will be captured by force, while others will be subjugated by means of bribes, coups and the old Chinese diplomacy of *chi mi* (attract by kindness).

The Maoist fanatics look to Mao Tse-tung as the direct heir of Genghis Khan, of the great-Han chauvinistic emperors of the Tang and Yuan dynasties, and in some respects even of Mohammed, whom the "great helmsman" admired because he "subjugated the world holding the Koran in his left hand and a sword in his right".[1]

One should speak outright about the aggressive foreign policy of such fanatics, and this has been done in the Statements of the Soviet Government of March 29 and June 13, 1969. It is both impossible and harmful to keep quiet about these schemes. Now Peking has almost ceased to make a secret of its idea of establishing Chinese hegemony over entire countries, and not only in Asia, but in Europe as well.

The ravings of madmen? Hallucinations of people blinded by megalomania? Quite so. There is no need to prove the untenability of the Maoist plans, which can be compared only with Hitler's racialist hallucinations. Yet it should be taken into consideration that it is these ravings about a new world Chinese system that now prompt the Peking extremists to stretch out a hand to Western imperialists and hint at their willingness to take part in the venture against the USSR and the socialist community. They endeavour to plunge the world into a third world war which will drain the life-blood of whole countries in the hope that it will enable them to carry through their great-power chauvinistic plan.

Hence the adventuristic policy of Chinese diplomacy. Hence the rout of the Communist Party of China and the provocations on the Soviet-Chinese border. Hence the violence of the hungweipings and the tsaofans, who had been herded into the streets, and whose actions prompted an

---

[1] *The World Today*, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, Vol. 24, No. 6, June 1968, p. 259.

overseas diplomat to say that the Maoists were in a state of exaltation and trance, in other words, they were possessed as though under nazism.

Hence such statements as the one made by Chou En-lai on January 18, 1968: "The purpose of the great cultural revolution is also to prepare for war."[1] And hence the jubilant headline across the entire page of the Munich fascist newspaper *Deutsche Nationalzeitung* which appeared several weeks after the provocations on the Ussuri: "Mao Tse-tung, the Saviour of Germany?" (or rather of the German revanchists).

Nothing to be surprised at. We'll be hearing about such slogans and statements in the FRG in the future, too. West German militarists and neonazis, who now openly call Mao Tse-tung "China's great führer", know that Peking's plans are directed not only against the USSR. They have first-hand information that Peking would have liked to blow up the entire socialist community, including countries in Europe upon which they themselves are setting their sights. German revanchists firmly remember Mao's words: "Strike at the head, the rest will fall apart of its own accord." The opponents of peace in the FRG and the PRC think, each in his own way, about one and the same thing. The head is the USSR. These people understand each other very well.

And so the Maoists' anti-communist domestic policy is mutating into an anti-communist foreign policy. The betrayal of the Chinese working class is followed by a betrayal of world socialism and the revolutionary movement. The implantation of the Mao personality cult is followed by the implantation of Asian Bonapartism. One thing leads to and explains the other. Now it is more than obvious that the "great cultural revolution" was a prelude to international anti-Soviet ventures. But the "storm in the world" which the Maoists are anxious to raise will inevitably turn against them.

Today naive and politically-inexperienced people in China are being brainwashed into believing that the Maoists' anti-Soviet course is allegedly designed to consolidate China's might, strengthen its international positions, promote fresh "revolutions" in Asia and so forth. These are the ploys of the obsessed. Of course, the Machiavellis in Peking are sure that they are more cunning than anyone else, including the people in the West with whom they want to conclude a deal at the expense of the Soviet Union. Actually the opposite is the case, and it is not Peking that plays with imperialism, but imperialism that plays with Peking. The "grandiose", "breath-taking" plan for a new Chinese empire is a utopia which the reactionaries in the West intend to use in their own, absolutely concrete interests. Peking will never create a world empire. But what they can still do in Peking is to become an accomplice of the Western "hawks" in their efforts to push the world, and China in the first place, towards a catastrophe.

There is no need to overestimate the significance of Maoism and to attribute to it the strength which it lacks at present. But neither should the Maoist threat be underestimated.

In our epoch, with its unexpected zigzags, striking paradoxes, unnatural political links and unprecedented instruments of death one has to be ready for anything, including a monstrous betrayal. Complacency has never benefited either individuals or nations. The wild dreams of the Maoists cannot scare the Soviet Union and push it off its peaceful road. It dealt with "hawks" on more than one occasion. The Soviet Government has announced that it is prepared to normalise relations with China through negotiations. This attitude reflects the will of the Soviet people. But we should like to repeat: no one has the right to trifle with peace, particularly in our epoch. "Great helmsmen" come and go. No one can say how long their dance on the brink of the precipice will last and what price the Chinese people will have to pay for it. But one thing is clear: history is against them.

*1969*

[1] *Sekai*, Tokyo, No. 3, March 1968.

## 7. MAOISM AND CHINESE HISTORY

One of the most interesting and important questions of our epoch is that of China's future. Today it is on the minds of people in all countries. It is clear to one and all that in very many respects the future of the world depends on the answer. A mere ten years ago it seemed that no such question existed, that it had been resolved with the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949. It was generally believed that there were no reasons for doubt. Almost all the friends of socialism were sure that having become a member of the socialist community China would firmly march in step with it, that it would surmount all difficulties and eventually become one of the greatest peace-loving powers of the world.

But as we now know things took a different turn. The world was in for a surprise which staggered millions of people as no other post-war political event. Maoist China betrayed the socialist community. Peking became an anti-Soviet city. And now the question of the place which China may occupy in the world in the coming years has emerged once again. Not a single thinking person can afford to ignore it.

There are not many nations in the world which have such a difficult, painful history as the people of China. The Chinese can be proud of their ancient culture, their indefatigable industriousness and their inviolable staunchness in the face of terrible ordeals. In their time Chinese



feudal lords, emperors and mandarins caused tremendous harm to neighbouring countries, but the world owes a great deal to the gifted nature of the Chinese people. This is undeniable. It is also a fact that in the past the world has not always acted justly towards the Chinese.

For two thousand years covering the slave-owning period and feudalism right up to the middle of the 19th century, China was undoubtedly a great power although a peculiar one according to European standards. It was lashed by numerous political and military storms and invaded by rapacious foreign conquerors. One ruling dynasty succeeded another, and the people groaned under the tyranny of brutal rulers. Yet China remained the oldest and the biggest Asian power. It was one of world's leading states.

Then, 130 years ago, China lost this place suddenly and for a long time, for more than a hundred years. A national tragedy overtook this great Asian power: it became a semi-colony. European and then Japanese imperialists attacked China, easily defeated its feudal lords and erased its name from the list of independent states. China was humbled as never before. It became a plaything in the hands of foreigners who plundered it, controlled its ports and scourged its population. The people of China were helpless.

The huge state, ranking second in size only to the Russian Empire, whose territory and population were greater than that of the whole of Europe, became one of the weakest in the world. There was reason to believe that China would shortly disappear from the political map of the world as an independent state and be partitioned among the great powers of Europe and America.

It was a national tragedy in the full sense of the word. Various Chinese governments continued to function in Peking, and all sorts of political and military cliques in the provinces which were dependent on diverse foreign patrons carried on their never-ending feuds. China still retained vast territories but it was no longer listed as a great power. During Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang regime, China's last bourgeois government, the country was

on the verge of complete occupation by Japan. And it was only Japan's rout in 1945, and China's entry into the world socialist system that saved it from destruction.

That took place some 20 years ago. Since then China has again become a great power. Having taken the path of socialist development it gained an important place in the world. But now, when it has replaced Marxism with Maoism, it can lose much, if not everything. Will it manage to retain its positions? There are arguments inferring that it will. There are considerations which point to the opposite.

What can strengthen China's might and influence and turn its immense population into one of the main impellents of world politics, and open a wide road to the future before it?

There is an answer and an explicit one. It was supplied by the Chinese communists themselves some time ago and now life confirms it concretely and even sharply.

It is necessary for China to take a resolute step forward and launch the construction of a socialist society without postponing it for tens and even hundreds of years. Without socialism China will never rise to its full stature. It is necessary to place the Chinese economy on its feet. It is necessary to consolidate the status of the main builder of socialism, the Chinese working class, and its vanguard, the Communist Party, to feed the nation and provide the Chinese countryside with modern farm machinery. It is necessary promptly and in a most decisive manner to raise the level of public education, train numerous cadres of highly-qualified specialists and cultural workers and give the Chinese socialist intelligentsia every opportunity to engage in fruitful work.

Finally, there is something which, perhaps, is most urgent and obvious: China has to adopt a foreign policy which would enable it to go ahead with socialist construction and become a mighty and influential power in what indeed would be the shortest possible period.

These are realistic calculations and not fantasy, an effective policy and not daydreams of the stupefied. This road was followed and not unsuccessfully by honest Chinese Communists during the Eighth Congress of the CPC and some time after it. China has no other road, neither from the standpoint of the practical, vital interests of its people, nor from the standpoint of the interests of world socialism. That's how things stand if common sense and reality are to be taken into account. It turns out, however, that that is not so if something else is taken into account, namely, great-power adventuristic considerations. Then everything in Chinese politics can indeed be turned upside-down and done the other way round.

If Peking's prime concern is to satisfy at all costs the hegemonic aspirations of some of its functionaries and do it during their lifetime, and resurrect Genghis Khan in the 20th century, then Chinese policy should obviously contradict common sense.

Having taken this road, China should, at the will of its leaders, plunge headlong into the riskiest and extremely dangerous ventures ignoring its real possibilities, the existing balance of forces, and its poverty and backwardness. It should move from conflict to conflict, from provocation to provocation and, in the final analysis, even base its calculations on another world war which, according to some of the present Peking leaders, will wipe out hundreds of millions of people, but strangely enough spare their own lives.

If these are Peking's aims, then its current policy, though mad, is nonetheless "logical" in its own way. We have had examples of such logical madness at the end of the thirties and the beginning of the forties in other parts of the world. Will we have another sample of it in the seventies?

It is difficult to forget the end results of such "logic" in the past.

Somewhere in the West, and evidently in Peking itself, it is believed that Maoist China, in spite of its backwardness and relative weakness, has a good chance to achieve its far-reaching plans. The idea is to play a four-handed game with the imperialists with the view to stabbing the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the back. By playing this game China can, or so it is claimed, count

on success without courting immediate disaster. Let's see if that is so.

What would China gain, for example, if it struck a deal with the rabid, anti-Soviet circles in the United States? Could it expect a major profit? One does not have to be a Machiavelli or a Talleyrand to foresee what it could lead to.

When four people gather around a card-table it often happens that one pair does not always play against the other. Anyone can, if he wishes, play at the expense of his partner. It is easier to cheat if one has a better hand and is more cunning than the others. Who holds more trumps, has greater material forces and is more experienced in international gambles? China or the USA? Who has inter-continental missiles and a powerful fleet stationed off the shores of the would-be partner? Who controls military blocs on two continents and enjoys economic and diplomatic superiority?

Putting it bluntly, Peking's deal with the "hawks" could only result in the betrayal of the entire national liberation movement in Asia and probably in Latin America, too. One can hardly imagine that the "hawks" would consent to anything less than that. Imperialism always exacts payment for its "friendship".

But that would only be part of the price. China's deal with the enemies of peaceful coexistence would be spearheaded against the Soviet Union. Everything points to the fact that Peking seriously hopes that in the event of a war against the USSR, whose outbreak is anticipated with such impatience by the Maoist extremists, it would be waged at the expense of the West. What incredible naïveté on the part of people who regard themselves the disciples of Machiavelli. Nothing could be more absurd than these calculations. The exact opposite is the case.

There is every indication that in the event of "concerted" aggression against the USSR the "hawks" will shift the brunt of the war on China which shares a common border with the USSR and has enormous manpower resources. They are not in the least concerned with what will happen to China. It will be the Chinese who, according



to the calculations of the "hawks", favouring closer relations with China will pull the chestnuts out of the fire. We know that this is a perfectly natural attitude of the imperialists. That's the only way they understand politics.

It will be recalled that in the initial period of the World War the US imperialists played such a double game terminating it only when the Soviet Army had already determined the outcome of the war. Since then, far from changing their methods, they have improved them. It is not at all surprising that anti-Soviet circles overseas are not averse to repeating the same experiment in the event of a third world war, but this time at the expense of China. One should squarely face the facts and not indulge in wishful thinking.

It is said that the Maoists have nothing against concluding an alliance with the devil himself, provided he will help them to translate their great-power chauvinistic plans into reality. But, as the ancients asserted, the devil is craftier than those who are prepared to sell their souls to him. As a rule an alliance with him is a very costly undertaking.

China's anti-Soviet deal with the Western "hawks" would not only be an unprecedented betrayal of socialism and the world revolutionary process which Peking loves to talk about. It would be a terrible blow at China itself. Another and an even more dreadful national tragedy would be inevitable. The first one deprived China of its independence for a hundred years, and it is difficult to foresee the results of a second one.

What other opportunities are available to the Chinese Machiavellis to effect their "grand anti-Soviet strategy"? To strike a deal with the West German revenge-mongers? But their leader Strauss, who almost openly favoured it, did not come to power in Bonn, and it is difficult to say at present whether he ever will. Even that, however, is not very important. The main thing is that the attitude of the West German militarists towards China is similar to that of the American ones. They think that if an assault is launched against the USSR the main front should be opened in Asia. A very attractive proposition

for Hitler's heirs, but for China it would be a leap into yet another abyss.

And if some Japanese neo-imperialists are contemplating the creation of a new Asian "co-prosperity sphere", they intend it only for themselves and not for China.

We are not making any hasty forecasts. Of course, Maoist China may strive in every way to become a hegemonic "super-power". It can dream of defeating or outwitting one or another side or all of them together, it can shout about the revolt of the "world village", it can pile up weapons thus making the people tighten their belts, militarise the country and unite the handfuls of its blinded supporters in other countries.

It can draw up and cancel ever new strategic and diplomatic plans, and even in a moment of stark frenzy plunge with tightly shut eyes into a gamble which will create a serious threat to peace. But Maoism lacks the material and ideological potential to fulfil its ambitions. All it can do is organise dangerous gambles which are doomed to failure from the very outset. Quite often history tolerates adventurists, but it will never allow anyone to reverse its course. In the second half of the twentieth century this fact is still unclear to, shall we say, simpletons.

Thinking Chinese, including politicians who are still sound of mind, should take this into consideration and do a great deal of pondering. It would be a good thing if they looked around and remembered the past.

There is no reason to wonder at the blind, despotic egocentrism of Chinese foreign policy of the distant feudal times because it was pursued by emperors and mandarins who knew nothing about the world beyond the limits of China, and thought that they ruled the earth. When the Russian ambassador Spafary came to Peking in 1676 the Chinese court demanded that he should kowtow to the emperor. The reason for this demand was given to Spafary by the Chinese dignitary Kuo Lai who said:

"Do not wonder that this is our custom, and tell your sovereign that just as there is one god in heaven, our one god on earth stands in the middle of the earth amidst all sovereigns and surrounded by all states. And this obeisance has been paid here invariably and will be paid always."



That was how they thought in Peking when emperors ruled China. But that was 300 years ago. Today the great-power chauvinistic egocentrism of Chinese foreign policy is even more ridiculous than ever before. For a socialist country such egocentrism which substitutes for internationalism is not only impermissible in principle, but also useless and destructive. Sensible people should see the world as it is.

Understand us correctly. China has every opportunity to occupy a place in the world worthy of its great and long-suffering people. It surmounted its national tragedy and became a great power when it joined the world socialist community. All its real gains that have been preserved to this day were attained in the course of the closest cooperation with this community, above all with the Soviet Union. This has been and remains the correct road for China to follow. Only by following it will China be able to advance and secure a great future for itself.

*1970*

## 8. BACKSTAGE MANOEUVRES

The Chinese journal *Hsuehhsi pipan* has published an article on Soviet-West German and Soviet-Chinese relations. Its author Shih Tsien-pin aims at sensationalism but is rather inept in all things, and the article merits attention only because all the facts in it are topsy-turvy. Actually everything is exactly the opposite of what the author says.

In the heat of a polemic people sometimes tend to be inexact and pass over in silence all that runs counter to their conceptions. But even then not all specialists have the audacity to adulterate history to such an extent as Shih Tsien-pin does.

Referring to Konrad Adenauer, FRG Chancellor from 1949 to 1963, he asserts that during the former's visit to Moscow in September 1955 he was invited to enter into a secret agreement against China. "The insistent request" that the FRG "should help the USSR to cope with red China", was allegedly repeated three times by the Soviet leadership.

This is an exact quotation. And not from an anecdote but from an article in a Maoist political journal. The author describes it as fresh proof that the Soviet Union intended and still intends to "absorb China", "build a vast empire" embracing Europe and Asia, and "rule the destinies of the world".

There is no need to argue with Shih Tsien-pin. Any person who is in his right mind will see that the reported



Soviet proposal to West Germany in 1955 to form an alliance against the PRC is a ludicrous, insane fabrication. The Maoists have been indulging in all sorts of inventions about Soviet policy for many years already and have broken all records in their endeavours, so that people are now quite used to them. But in this case the author pursues a different objective.

His main aim is not to heap more slander on Soviet policy, but rather to conceal something very important about *Peking*'s policy. It is a fact that the period in question, i.e. the 1950s and 1960s, when the Right-wing party of Adenauer and his successors was in power in the FRG, strenuous efforts were made to arrange a secret deal between the Maoists and the West German revanchists.

Moreover there is reason to assert that from the very beginning an important role in this matter was played by a certain group among the revanchists, namely the old, confirmed nazis who led the Adenauerites by the rein. It was they who were chiefly responsible for the establishment of connections with Peking. This can be traced in all the ramifications of the Right-wing camp in West Germany: at diplomatic level, in monopoly circles, among the brass, in the CDU and CSU parties and in the press. Everywhere one and the same thing leaped to the eye: the old Hitlerites and their present-day disciples feverishly worked for a rapprochement with China, and there were all indications that they followed a pre-arranged plan.

If history is studied seriously and conscientiously, and not re-written with Adenauer's or Shih Tsien-pin's pen, then the following picture will emerge.

In the first place it is necessary to take account of the sort of forces which guided Adenauer's diplomacy in those years. Peking was never in doubt with whom it was conducting business. Much has changed in the FRG since then; the government of Social Democrats and Free Democrats at present in power in Bonn has signed treaties with the USSR, Poland, the GDR and Czechoslovakia and is working for the further improvement of relations with the socialist countries. Other people now stand at the

helm of West German diplomacy and its policy pursues different aims than in the initial post-war period. But at that time the basis of this policy was revanchism and its apparatus was wholly in the hands of the revanchists.

In those days Asian affairs in Adenauer's Foreign Ministry were handled by its "Eastern department". Following the establishment of the Foreign Ministry in 1949 this department was staffed in a very short period and occupied a prominent place in it. It was enough to take a close look at the people who were employed in its sectors to see that it was Ribbentrop's old Asian department which was transferred almost intact from Berlin to Bonn. Compared with the 1930s and the 1940s it underwent much lesser change than any other department of the Bonn ministry. Who was responsible for West Germany's Asian policy under Adenauer and his successors in the same party?

In the mid-1950s when a sudden interest in China developed on the Rhine, the Eastern department was headed by an old and tested nazi Otto Bräutigam who had worked for Ribbentrop and Rosenberg during the Second World War. He was responsible for the extermination of hundreds of thousands of Jews in Eastern Europe.[1] The first contacts between Adenauer and Peking were established when this nazi diplomat was in office. Subsequently Bräutigam retired, but judging by everything he continued to act behind the scenes. In a speech at the influential Düsseldorf club of the Ruhr magnates on April 23, 1969, he declared: "Apparently China is prepared to meet us half-way.... In this matter all of us must display the greatest caution. Yet we must keep a careful watch over the course of events in order to ascertain where our chances lie."[2] The old Hitlerite, however, did not say what chances he had in mind.

After Bräutigam's retirement the post of head of the Eastern department went to Georg Ferdinand Duckwitz. He had joined the Nazi party in 1933 and worked in its

[1] *Pravda*, June 17, 1959, January 28, 1956; W. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, New York, 1962, pp. 1226-27.

[2] An AND report from Düsseldorf, 24. 4. 1969.



foreign policy department.[1] He followed in the steps of his predecessor. Duckwitz was succeeded by a still more notorious figure: Franz Krapf, member of the Nazi party since 1936, secretary of the German embassy in Tokyo during the war and simultaneously an SS agent in the Far East.[2] Direct Bonn-Peking links were established under the guidance of this former SS man.

In 1964 Krapf went to Switzerland for a secret meeting with Mao Tse-tung's emissaries. It took place in the Chinese embassy in Bern and almost resulted in the conclusion of a deal: a trade agreement between the FRG and the PRC as a prelude to the establishment of diplomatic relations. Later Ernst Majonica, a CDU deputy in the Bundestag, reported that Mao's emissaries were prepared to recognise the FRG's "rights" to West Berlin. On July 10, 1964, Mao Tse-tung did in fact venomously attack the Soviet Union's stand on the German question. In a talk with foreign delegations he even went so far as to say that the FRG "should not recognise the Oder-Neisse border as yet", i.e. that it was entitled to think of revenge.

Moreover, the Maoists claimed that in keeping with Section II of the Potsdam Agreement, China was also "responsible" for German affairs. They also emphasised that the PRC had never demanded that the "reunification of Germany should take place under the protection of socialism". The Maoists could not make it clearer that they were prepared to betray the GDR to the revanchists. Later, according to the US press, Peking informed Adenauer that it was prepared to lower the status of the Chinese embassy in the GDR to that of an ordinary legation. The *Augsburger Algemeine Zeitung*, which is close to Strauss' Bavarian Right-wing party, reported with undisguised approval: "The Peking chargé d'affaires in Paris hinted that in the course of the development of trade relations with the FRG Peking would be prepared

[1] *Nazi-Diplomaten in Bonner Diensten*, Dresden, S. 45, *Wer ist Wer?* Berlin, 1962, S. 271.

[2] *Nazi-Diplomaten*, S. 48; *Braunbuch*, Berlin, 1965, SS. 248-49; *Graubuch*, Berlin, 1967, S. 115.

to recognise the Hallstein Doctrine and, consequently, sever relations with the GDR, recognise the FRG as the sole German state and regard the GDR as a West German Taiwan. . . ." The Maoists could have hardly gone any further to meet the revanchists half-way.

Krapf was prevented from bringing his negotiations to a successful conclusion by US interference in 1964 when President Johnson demanded that Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, who was on a visit to Washington, should refrain from striking a deal with China.[1] But the old Gestapo hand did his bit. Since then it has become clear that the first point in Bonn's deal with Peking was to have been Mao's consent to the seizure of the GDR by the revanchists. The second point was evidently Adenauer's consent to the seizure of certain Soviet territories by the Maoists. Thus, on paper, Hitler's epigones intended to recarve the maps of Europe and Asia together with the Maoists. It should be added that the failure of Krapf's mission did not bring his career to an end. And in 1969, as Bonn's ambassador to Tokyo, he continued his intrigues from there.

A similar course was pursued methodically and tirelessly by other specialists from the Asian sectors of Adenauer's Foreign Ministry, people with the same background as Krapf, Bräutigam and Duckwitz. Later, the section concerned with China was headed by Luitpold Werz, a former member of Ribbentrop's embassy in Thailand and a member of the Nazi party since 1934.[2] The deputy head of the Eastern department was Heinrich Northe, a nazi since 1935 and former adviser of the Hitlerite embassy in China.[3] The department's East Asian sector was guided by the nazi Hilmar Bassler. This man was in charge of propaganda in East Asia in Ribbentrop's ministry and also worked for the Gestapo. Later he was posted as ambassador to Indonesia.[4] Employed in the rank of ambassador in the Eastern department was Martin Fischer, a member of the Nazi party since 1943, and one-time deputy to the Hitlerite ambassador in China.[1]

Almost all the key posts in Adenauer's diplomatic network in Asia were occupied by the same nazi clique whose members were obviously connected by reciprocal bonds. The ambassador in India was Baron Dietrich von Mirbach, a nazi since 1933, and former press attaché in the Hitlerite embassy in Tokyo; the ambassador in Malaysia was Horst Böhling, former nazi vice-consul in Nanking; the ambassador in the Philippines was Heinrich Röhreke, a nazi since 1937 and former Hitlerite consul in Hankow; the ambassador in Thailand was Ulrich Scheske, a member of the SS since 1933; the ambassador in South Korea was Franz Ferring, former referent on propaganda in East Asia in Ribbentrop's ministry; the ambassador in Singapore was Baron Oswald von Richthofen, a nazi since 1938 and an SS man.[2]

They were all birds of a feather. Ribbentrop's old cadres replaced one another in the Asian embassies of the West German governments of Adenauer, Erhard and Kiesinger, and all zealously advocated an alliance with the Maoists. It was not surprising that pro-Chinese sentiments in the official circles on the Rhine continued to grow, being nurtured as they were by the old Asian department in Ribbentrop's ministry which in fact had never interrupted its activity.

Adenauer conducted his dealings with Peking at different times and through different channels, particularly through Bern and Tokyo. But there was one channel through which daily contact was maintained–the FRG consulate-general in Hongkong, a Chinese port bordering on the PRC and still a British possession.

For several years it was the site of a diplomatic bridge between the revanchists and the Maoists. The FRG consulate-general was a veritable secret embassy of revanchist diplomacy in China and arranged the necessary meetings

---

[1] *Der Spiegel*, Hamburg, 24. 2. 1969; *Junge Welt*, Berlin, 28. 3. 1969.

[2] *Die Bundesrepublik 1966/67*, 1967, S. 58; *Graubuch* S. 114.

[3] *Nazi-Diplomaten*, S. 51; *Wer ist Wer?*, 1962, S. 1105.

[4] *Nazi-Diplomaten*, S. 43; *Graubuch*, S. 114.



[1] *Graubuch*, S. 265; *Handbuch für das Deutsche Reich*, Berlin, 1936, S. 39.

[2] *Nazi-Diplomaten*, SS. 50, 44, 52, 53, 45.

at the shortest notice. Who was in charge of this camouflaged embassy? The same old Hitlerites.

At the end of the 1950s the FRG Consul-General in Hongkong was the very same former Gestapo agent Bräutigam who prior to his new posting was in charge of the Eastern department of the FRG Foreign Ministry. The appointment of such a high official to the post of consul attested to the importance which Adenauer and his entourage attached to the Hongkong "bridge". Later Adenauer's personal referent Franz-Josef Bach[1] was sent to Hongkong, clearly by the Chancellor himself. Under Erhard, Bach was replaced by the former FRG ambassador to South Korea Karl Bünger,[2] who had once been on the staff of the Hitlerite embassy in Shanghai. In 1969 Wilhelm G. Heyden, one of Ribbentrop's diplomats and a member of the Nazi party since 1934, was made the FRG Consul-General in Hongkong.[3] Obviously, the neonazis were not barred from the FRG consulate in Hongkong; neither had they to seek for loopholes to keep in touch with the PRC. The "bamboo curtain" would be raised for them whenever they wished.

In 1964 the leader of the revanchists Strauss unexpectedly arrived in Hongkong. Upon his return he announced: "Peking could contribute to the reunification of Germany."[4] He did not disclose who gave him such assurances, but in his book *Herausforderung und Antwort* he underscored that in view of their attitude to the USSR the interests of the FRG and China "partially coincide".[5] In this connection Strauss' newspaper *Bayern-Kurier* even recalled the old saying: "An enemy of my enemy is my friend".

It looked as though the nazi clique entrenched in Hongkong had indeed managed to recruit influential friends on the other side of the bamboo curtain by acting in co-operation with the FRG ambassador in Tokyo Krapf. Another thing has to be taken into account, namely that the West German Consul-General in Hongkong is also his country's consul in Macau, a neighbouring Chinese port which still belongs to Portugal and is a centre of wild speculation in gold and opium. It is an open secret that the main speculators in Macau and Hongkong are closely linked with Peking. For instance, the head of the gold syndicate in Macau a multi-millionaire Ho Jin, owner of four banks, five hotels, two newspapers and all the cinemas in the city, is a member of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference in Peking.[1] His partner in the gold syndicate is the Hongkong millionaire Y.C. Liang, owner of the Hang Hsing bank.[2] These dealers have direct access to the Peking court, and the nazi clique in Hongkong broadly employs their services. In return the Chinese millionaires were made intermediaries in the extremely profitable West German-Chinese trade.

For several years these affairs were the special concern of the FRG vice-consul and "trade attache" in Hongkong Fritz Cordt who had lived in pre-war China ostensibly as a fur dealer and later worked in the Hitlerite Consulate-General in Shanghai. Operating from Hongkong this former nazi agent helped to organise China's trade with the FRG, particularly the import of West German military materials. Cordt gained Peking's special confidence back in the 1950s and received invitations to make long trips in China.[3]

That was how the Hongkong bridge worked. Wherever and whatever posts they held the old Hitlerites pushed Bonn towards Peking and Peking towards Bonn.

Why did they work so hard in this direction? Why were they so determined to establish the Bonn-Peking axis? It's all very simple. Hitler's successors regarded an alliance with the Maoists, who had betrayed the socialist cause, as a key to their entire foreign policy.

Contemporary German reactionaries are searching for

---

[1] *Wer ist Wer?*, 1962, S. 37.

[2] *Wer ist Wer?*, 1967/68, S. 242; *Braunbuch*, S. 234.

[3] *Nazi-Diplomaten*, S. 47.

[4] Hans Frederik, *Franz Josef Strauss*, München-Inning, 1965, S. 227.

[5] F. J. Strauss, *Herausforderung und Antwort*, Stuttgart, 1968, S. 96.

[1] *Daily Star*, 1. 1. 1967.

[2] *Industriekurier, Düsseldorf*, 11. 5. 1968, S. 7.

[3] *Handelsblatt*, Düsseldorf, 15. 11. 1967; *Junge Welt*, March 28, 1969.

suitable allies on the international scene, those who like them are prepared to plunge into the maddest ventures. Only one government in the world, Maoist China's, believes that it would profit from a third world war. The situation is clear to the rightists in the FRG: they regard the PRC as their natural ally.

This, however, does not mean that the West German neonazis and revanchists would have preferred to repudiate their partnership with the USA in NATO. So long as the United States was opposed to a relaxation of international tension, the revanchists, naturally, had no reason to change allies. But now they posed the question differently: who will agree to become our partner and help us push the world towards war, if the politicians of the moderate bourgeoisie, and supporters of peaceful coexistence, gain the upper hand in the United States?

This consideration prompted West German reactionaries to place their stakes on Mao, and accounted for the feverish activity in the old Asian department of Ribbentrop's ministry which was living its second life on the Rhine. The backstage manoeuvres of the advocates of an alliance with Peking continued without interruption. And not only diplomats were involved. There were others who went along with them.

For a number of years an organisation which could be called the Chinese lobby in the FRG openly and broadly propagandised a rapprochement with China. Its members were active everywhere: in the corridors of the Bundestag, in the reception halls of the CDU/CSU leaders, in the press and in Bundeswehr circles, but not all of them were known to the public. Although this was not simply an organisation of the bourgeoisie but even of the large-scale bourgeoisie, it had very close links with Peking. Judging by everything, it often enough acted as an intermediary in Bonn's unofficial relations with Peking, and, of course, its leaders fulfilled special missions on behalf of Adenauer's officials.

Very little is known of the history of its foundation. An association calling itself the Deutschen China-Gesellschaft



(German China Society) suddenly announced its existence in Hamburg. This was in September 1957. Its founding fathers, about a hundred in all, were prominent merchants, bankers, shipowners, journalists, retired officials and some Bundestag deputies. The society made it known that it would work to strengthen West Germany's friendship with China by organising lectures and exhibitions, spreading information about the PRC, and arranging cultural exchanges and personal contacts.[1]

It promptly came to light that it enjoyed the all-round support of the Peking authorities. Bundestag deputy Ernst Majonica, the unofficial representative of the Chiang Kai-shek government in Bonn, asserted that the German China Society conducted Maoist propaganda and even favoured the extension of the PRC's borders.[2] In 1961, an emergency meeting of the society's members demanded that the Bonn government should sign a trade agreement and establish diplomatic relations with China. "The time for this has come,"[3] stated a resolution adopted at the meeting.

Since then the Chinese lobby in West Germany has been working without a pause, doing practically nothing to conceal its links with influential circles in Bonn. The society's chairman bluntly stated: "Now we would like to do what the Federal Government, which has to take the US into consideration, cannot do." In other words, a division of labour was practised. The FRG Foreign Ministry had to "refute" the assertion of the society's leaders who said that they "regard themselves as an ancillary apparatus of the ministry and Bonn's secret diplomats arranging contacts with Red China".[4] There were ample signs that the influence of the Chinese lobby in Bonn steadily increased. Who was behind this organisation? Who founded the German China Society?

It was founded by people all of whom have sinister dossiers.

---

[1] *Hamburger Nachrichten*, 9. 9. 1957.
[2] *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, München, 10. 9. 1957.
[3] *Neue Politik*, Hamburg, 11. 7. 1961, SS. 414-15; *Junge Welt*, 28. 3. 1969, 29. 3. 1969.
[4] *Der Tagesspiegel*, Berlin, 6. 1. 1968, S. 5.

The society's first chairman–"journalist" Wolf Schenke, editor of the Hamburg *Neue Politik* journal, is known to have been a nazi agent in Chiang Kai-shek China for 11 years. Upon returning to Germany after the war, Schenke co-operated for a time with the notorious nazi general Alexander Andrae who committed atrocities in Greece and after the war took part in the creation of the Deutsche Reichs-Partei, the forerunner of the present-day neofascist NDP.[1] In 1957 Schenke began to work in the German China Society, but no one knew exactly on whose instructions.

Another founder of the society was the former FRG ambassador to Indonesia Werner-Otto von Hentig. He, too, is an interesting figure. Under Hitler he was on the staff of the same Asian department of Ribbentrop's ministry which continued to exist in the Foreign Ministry of the Adenauer government. Von Hentig was one of those old German diplomats who devoted his life to plotting intrigues and conspiracies in the East. Resigning his post as West Germany's ambassador in Indonesia, he became an adviser to King Saud, the feudal ruler of Saudi Arabia,[2] and then turned up as one of the founding fathers of the German China Society. There is no need to dwell on what circles he represented.

The third organiser of the "Chinese lobby" in Hamburg, who subsequently became its chairman, was Fritz Cordt, the same "fur dealer" and official of the Hitlerite consulate-general in Shanghai, who being in Hongkong after the war helped the West German monopolies to organise trade with China and the Adenauer diplomats to establish their first contacts with the Maoists. When he returned to West Germany from Hongkong this old nazi dealer became the head of the German China Society.[3]

---

[1] W. Schenke, *Neue Weltmacht China*, Hamburg, 1957, Umschlag; *Neue Politik*, 22. 3. 1969, S. 3; 8. 7. 1961, S. 435; M. Jenke, *Verschwörung von rechts?* Berlin, 1961, S. 374.

[2] *Wer ist Wer?*, 1962, S. 570.

[3] *Kölner Stadtanzeiger*, 6-7, 1. 1968; *Handelsblatt*, Düsseldorf, 15. 11. 1967.



There are other prominent nazis and diehard German reactionaries among the founders of the German China Society, including former Bundestag deputy Hermann Schwann, H. Focke, designer of the Focke-Wulf bombers, and Peter Rickmers, a Hamburg shipowner.[1] The society's legal adviser, a deputy from Adenauer's party and a former "military representative" of the Bundestag, M. Hoogen, was a court-martial judge in Goering's Luftwaffe HQ.

From the very beginning, however, the main role in the Chinese lobby was played by another man who preferred to keep in the shade. On the list of members of the society's "constituent committee" we find the name of none other than Hjalmar Schacht, a veteran banker and Hitler's trusted financial adviser who faced the Nuremberg Tribunal in 1946 as a war criminal. Schacht, who for many years was one of the sliest and most sordid inspirers of nazism, apparently became the heart and soul of the pro-Maoist lobby in West Germany. There are facts indicating that he helped to establish important contacts and procure funds. We shall yet return to the backstage role that was played by Hitler's former treasurer in West German-Chinese relations.

Thus the picture seems to be clear. The Maoist lobby in the FRG was run by the same forces which guided the Asian sectors of Adenauer's Foreign Ministry. They were out-and-out nazis who staked everything on the creation of the Bonn-Peking axis.

The true story behind the establishment of the German China Society, according to certain facts, is as follows.

In the mid-1950s, when Mao Tse-tung began to depart more and more perceptibly from the international communist movement and prepare for a break with the Soviet Union, the nazi circles and the monopolists in the FRG, especially those closely connected with Schacht, decided that they had to strike while the iron was hot. The FRG consul-general in Hongkong Bräutigam and his "commercial" assistant Cordt, both diehard nazis, were instructed to arrange contacts behind the bamboo curtain. After that

---

[1] *Leitende Männer der deutschen Wirtschaft*, Berlin, 1959, S. 735.

the former German intelligence agent in China Schenke was sent to Peking ostensibly as a special correspondent for Springer's revanchist *Die Welt* newspaper. Bundestag deputy Schwann with whom he was on close terms also went there.

The two men spent several weeks in China. Schwann was received by Chou En-lai himself. It was the first meeting of a Bundestag deputy with the Chinese premier. The topic of their conversation was not published. Later Schenke wrote in his journal that Schwann was exceptionally well received in Peking where he met with "leading personalities" and managed to establish a very delicate relationship[1]. The idea of setting up a Chinese lobby in the FRG won Peking's approval. The West German press subsequently reported that Chou En-lai and other Chinese leaders assured the West German emissaries that the German China Society would greatly benefit both sides and that its delegation would be invited to visit China.[2]

The Chinese lobby continued to function. Its nationalist leaders lauded Mao Tse-tung and justified the "cultural revolution". In 1969 Chairman of the German China Society Schenke declared that Maoist China had become a "key force" of world politics and that the "Chinese miracle by far surpasses all events, all the major turns in the history of mankind".[3] The main thing he pointed out, was that "China is the sole great world power which in furtherance of its own interests should work for the re-establishment of German unity (i.e., for the absorption of the GDR by the revanchists–*E.H.*) and moreover, for the establishment of a united Europe"[4] (under their leadership–*E.H.*).

The pro-Maoist nazis laid special emphasis on the need for the Western world to give little credence to Peking's "communist" phraseology. "Against the background of the 2,500-year-old history of the Chinese Empire the communist ideology means very little," said Schenke in one of

[1] *Neue Politik*, 29. 3. 1969, S. 1, 3.
[2] *Rheinischer Merkur*, Koblenz, 13. 9. 1967, S. 6.
[3] *Neue Politik*, 29. 3. 1969, SS. 1, 11.
[4] *Ibid.*, S. 4.



his public appearances. "It is only a transitional stage and a means for doing away with backwardness."[1]

The Maoists' "leftist" verbiage was disregarded by their allies in the FRG. But they were keenly interested in something else. In his book *Neue Weltmacht China* published in the 1960s Schenke wrote: "Then, if China does not come under attack, it will, in the event of war, transcend its borders. Acting either as a friendly unifier, or by force, it will occupy the whole of Korea and the whole of Southeast Asia. It will promptly seize Burma and Thailand, the world's biggest rice exporters, and thus gain control over the supply of food and other raw materials to Japan and other Asian countries. Weighing the chances of the sides in a future war from the standpoint of the old power politics, the following conclusion almost suggests itself: the side which China will oppose will definitely loose. In the event of an atomic war unquestionably, in the event of a 'conventional' war just as probably."[2]

That was what the West German reactionaries thought and counted upon as they dreamed about a Bonn-Peking axis. Hitler once explained to his associates: ". . .The essential thing is to win–and to that end we are quite ready to make an alliance with the Devil himself." Hitler's disciples among the revanchist diplomats and in the Hamburg Chinese lobby worked towards the same goal.

True, all this applied to the groups at the top which had no support of the masses. Indeed no attention could have been paid to the nazi pro-Maoists across the Elbe if they had not relied on incomparably more influential forces–the ultra-Right monopolists, who were interested in the arms race and, consequently, in an aggravation of international relations, and the reactionary militarist circles. Here are some facts.

In the post-war years the FRG and China had neither diplomatic relations, nor a trade agreement. Yet no other European country traded so extensively with the PRC. The

[1] *Der Tagesspiegel*, 11. 2. 1966, S. 10.
[2] Wolf Schenke, *Neue Weltmacht China*, Hamburg, 1967, SS. 305–06.

West regarded the amazing growth in West German-Chinese trade as something barely short of a miracle. In 1955 their trade stood at zero level, in 1957 it was valued at DM 230 million, in 1961–283 million, in 1966–888 million, in 1967–more than 1,000 million and in 1968–1,200 million. Only Japan, owing to its favourable geographic position, had a greater volume of trade with China. American, British and French exporters were frankly envious of the FRG's successes. Indeed, history records only few examples of such quick leaps in trade between two countries in so short a period.

All this took place with the active participation of the German China Society and its sponsors in Peking. In February 1966 it held a meeting which was addressed by an "economic expert on Eastern affairs" Karl Titscher. Saying that the "breach between Moscow and Peking was a fait accompli", he made it known that he had met Chou En-lai who assured him that Peking was interested in expanding West German-Chinese trade. Quite probably, he added meaningfully, a contributing factor could be Peking's renunciation of the "theory of two German states", i.e., of the fact that the GDR is an independent state.

The FRG economy began to display increasing interest in exports to China. Already in the mid-1960s exports to the Far East were considered to be a matter of great importance by many West German businessmen. The newly-created war industry in Maoist China expanded with their assistance. Some specialists predicted that in the near future China would become one of the FRG's leading trading partners, and that the "inexhaustible" Far Eastern market would prove to be a sort of an Ali Baba's cave for West German industry. One way or another, there can be no doubt that Peking's economic rapprochement with the FRG prompted their political rapprochement.

And here we come up against the same question: who was behind all this? Who organised the Bonn-Peking commercial "miracle"?

It strikes the eye when analysing the commodity exchange between the FRG and the PRC that as far as West Germany was concerned this trade was not divided among



small-scale suppliers. It was almost wholly in the hands of the biggest monopolies which signed deals worth tens and even hundreds of millions of marks with the Chinese Government. The main role in it was played by a group of leading West German military concerns which supplied China with equipment for manufacturing armaments, particularly for the atomic, missile, electronic and iron and steel industries.

All of them were leading West German industrial concerns, pillars supporting the edifice of the monopoly oligarchy, and all of them had a nazi past. Since the Maoists paid well it was not surprising that these concerns displayed an interest in Chinese business and helped to organise it on a large scale. But lacking a trade agreement such major transactions, which were already valued at hundreds of millions of marks, clearly demanded a deal at the highest level. It is definitely interesting to know something about the people who brought the archreactionary West German dealers and the "archrevolutionary" Maoists together.

In the mid-1950s Arthur Axmann, a West German "businessman" arrived in China. He said that he went there on behalf of his brother Kurt Axmann, a West Berlin dealer. Axmann spent two months in China and it is not known whom he met with in Peking. Quite probably his trip was arranged with Peking by the same West German "trade attaché" in Hongkong Cordt who later became head of the pro-Maoist German China Society in Hamburg.

Axmann did not return to the FRG alone, but with a PRC trade delegation whose leader told the press that he had "insisted" that Axmann should accompany it.[1] It was then that the syndicate of West German industrialists signed the first agreement with the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade. In this agreement West Berlin was illegally included in the zone of the Bonn mark. Shortly after a firm calling itself China Trade Society was set up in the FRG. Its executives were Arthur and Kurt

[1] *Der Tagesspiegel*, 8. 5. 1958, S. 2.

Axmann.[1] This bureau became an intermediary between the West German monopolies and Peking.

Who is Arthur Axmann?

In 1940 Hitler made him Reichsjugendführer, a post which he held until the last day of the Third Reich. Axmann was very close to Hitler who intended to appoint him to high posts in the Reich and the Nazi party. He was also among the handful of fanatical nazis who during the storm of Berlin by the Soviet troops hid with Hitler in the bunker of the Reichschancellory and fled from there only after his master's suicide. In those days the Jugendführer raised detachments of young boys who were sent to their death on the outskirts of the city.

His brother Kurt also had a fairly high post in the nazi hierarchy; he was Jugendführer in Brandenburg.

When Hitlerism collapsed Axmann remained in West Berlin where he continued his activity. He was one of those who already in the first post-war years tried to revive the Nazi party. There is documentary proof that it was Axmann who helped Goebbels' former deputy and "heir" W. Naumann to convene for this purpose a secret congress of former gauleiters and SS generals in Düsseldorf and Hamburg in 1951. He himself took part in the gathering.[2] Since then there are links leading from Axmann and Naumann to von Thadden, the then führer of the neonazi NDP. But it is just as certain that Axmann's main occupation in the 1950s and 1960s was "commercial" mediation between the West German monopolists and Peking. It can be imagined that one day light will be shed on how Hitler's former associate became a confidential agent of the Maoist leaders. And it is a fact that he did become their agent.

Axmann was a nazi gangster. He knew how to organise pogroms and raise bands of armed boys. Where could such a person gain experience in commercial affairs? Who furnished him with money and granted him the power of attorney to act on behalf of Bonn millionaires? In order to answer these questions one has only to recall that his mentor and actual business manager of the China Trade Society was the former banker and Hitler's closest adviser Hjalmar Schacht.

[1] Paul Meskil, *Hitler's Heirs. Where are They Now?*, New York, 1961, p. 185.

[2] *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 10. 6. 1953.



There is no need to relate Schacht's dossier; his name is connected with the grimmest pages of the history of the German Empire. It is known that as a leading banker of the Weimar Republic he helped Hitler rise to power by securing for him the backing of the Ruhr magnates. It is known that after that Schacht became Hitler's "financial wizard" who conceived the most unusual methods of financing Germany's armament. It is known that in 1946 he faced the Nuremberg Tribunal as one of the chief war criminals and owed his acquittal solely to Western judges.

It has been claimed that in the post-war years Schacht took no part in politics and devoted himself exclusively to private commercial matters, that is to the affairs of his new Aussenhandelsbank Schacht & Co. in Düsseldorf. His companion in this enterprise was Count Bismarck, a former diplomat under Ribbentrop. The truth about Schacht's new occupation surfaced only several years after the founding of the bank in Düsseldorf. Once again it was political business and nothing more. Some informed people overseas asserted that Schacht was mainly responsible for the organisation of the entire post-war trade between the FRG and China.[1]

His Foreign Trade Bank promptly orientated its activity on the Asian and African countries. When the bank was opened back in 1933 Schacht said: "Once again the time has come when we can penetrate the southeastern expanse from Sarajevo to Japan. The biggest country in this expanse is China."[2] An old friend and adviser of Flick, Abs and other West German magnates, Schacht began to persuade them to "go East" and use the FRG's reserves of foreign

[1] *Wer ist Wer?*, 1967/68, S. 1669; Der *Volkswirt*, Frankfurt, 12. 1. 1957; *Die Welt*, Hamburg, 7. 9. 1961.

[2] ADP report, 15. 1. 1957.

currency to break through to the Asian markets. In 1957 he became one of the actual initiators of the establishment of the German China Society in Hamburg. By then Hitler's former banker was 80 years old.

Two years later Schacht went to the Far East and stopped over in Hongkong where Ribbentrop's old diplomats had weaved their nest. Reports said that he went on to Tokyo where he proposed to Japanese Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi to draw up a joint Japanese-German plan "for the economic development of the underdeveloped countries", China in the first place. Prior to that, thanks to Schacht's efforts, the former Hitler youth leader Axmann was invitied to visit China. Founded by the Axmann brothers, the China Trade Company was in fact a branch of the Aussenhandelsbank Schacht & Co.

Through this branch Schacht arranged deals between Bonn monopolies and Peking, helping the Maoists to purchase West German steel, machines, equipment and atomic and chemical materials. He and Axmann helped to recruit West German atomic specialists for work in China, and arranged that the FRG Government guaranteed West German exporters payment for Chinese orders. Schacht also bought up the shares of Schantung Handels-AG,[1] the oldest German colonial society which formerly operated in one of China's provinces.

All this tremendously boosted West German-Chinese trade which created such a stir in the West. Having arranged this matter, Schacht re-established his reputation of "financial wizard" in West German big business circles.

In effect he was again making big nazi policy. After his acquittal by the Nuremberg Tribunal he did not sever his old ties with the nazi nucleus which found a haven in the FRG. In addition to Axmann, Schacht maintained contacts with Naumann,[2] a man who for years stood behind the

[1] *The Economist*, London, January 25, 1964, p. 329.

[2] As reported by the FRG Minister of the Interior on May 6, 1959.



neonazis, and with the nazi hatchet man Otto Skorzeni[1] who was married to Schacht's niece. It is more than obvious that Schacht and Axmann arranged the union of West German monopolies with the Maoists not only because it was a profitable undertaking, but in the first place because it furthered the interests of Adenauer's foreign policy.

In 1969 Schacht was 92.[2] Several years earlier the West German press reported that he had retired and sold his bank. But by then this unscrupulous banker had already rendered his last service to nazism. With the help of the old Hitlerite dealers the revanchists established strong commercial ties with the Maoists.

We spoke about the secret strings connecting rightist West German diplomats, political lobbyists and large-scale dealers with the Maoists. Everywhere and in every case they were guided by one and the same hand which operated behind the scenes: the hand of the old nazis. Were the reactionary militarist circles in Bonn also woven into this web of proponents of a deal with the Maoists?

At first glance it may appear that these militarist circles, which were dependent on the Pentagon and joined no blocs without its consent, could have no points of contact with China. But that was not the case.

The very idea of setting up an anti-Soviet Bonn-Peking axis, just as the idea of the Berlin-Tokyo axis in its time, had a direct military connotation for the erstwhile Wehrmacht generals and colonels who were obsessed with the thought of encircling the USSR. There are no grounds for doubting that these people were no less concerned with building bridges between the FRG and China, than the rightist Bonn monopolists and diplomats. German militarists have never missed an opportunity to secure an ally in the rear of the would-be enemy: this is one of the main principles of their age-old strategy. Shortly after the Second World War they turned their eyes to the Far East

[1] *Hamburger Echo*, January 16, 1953.

[2] He died in 1970.–*Ed.*

and began to think precisely along these lines, all the more so because they had started building bridges to China many years before. Already at that time the nazis had begun to construct the abutments on the German bank.

These are some of the facts about the history of Maoist relations with the German revanchists during the Right-wing regime in the FRG. But perhaps these contacts have been severed in recent years, particularly after the fall of the Kiesinger-Strauss government?

No, they haven't. Facts prove the opposite. The coming to power of the coalition of Social-Democrats and Free Democrats in Bonn did not reverse the desire of the Maoists to strike a deal with the German revanchists.

At the end of 1972 CDU Deputy Chairman Gerhard Schröder, former Foreign Minister in the Kiesinger Government and an ex-nazi, accompanied by a crowd of journalists arrived in Peking at the invitation of the Maoist leaders. He received a demonstratively pompous reception. "It is not a secret," wrote the *Neue Rhein-Zeitung*, a newspaper close to the West German Social-Democrats, "that there are people in the CDU/CSU who would have liked to pursue the Eastern policy (FRG's policy towards the USSR and other European socialist countries–*E.H.*) in a roundabout way, i.e. through China. Their motto is: the enemy of my enemy may become my friend."[1] It explained the motives which prompted rightist circles in the FRG to send Schröder's mission to Peking. As regards the motives which actuated the Maoists at this meeting, they were explained by another West German newspaper the *Westfälische Rundschau:* "Peking has benefited from Schröder's visit. But the Chinese look further ahead. They are interested in seeing not the Social-Democratic or the Free Democratic parties in power in Bonn, but the CDU/CSU which, if they managed to return to power, would keep their distance from Eastern Europe, focus their attention on Western Europe and start to search for contacts with China."

[1] *Neue Rhein-Zeitung*, 14. 7. 1972.



Thus, the foursome continued, in spite of everything, even in 1972. But that was not the end of the matter. In the summer of 1974 two other leaders of the Right-wing camp in the FRG were invited to Peking. They were CDU Chairman Helmut Kohl, and the ringleader of the Bavarian reactionaries Franz Josef Strauss who had already visited Hongkong. *Izvestia* reported at the time: "Efforts are being made in Peking to stimulate the activity of West German revanchist circles. In effect the Chinese leadership supports the forces favouring a revision of the results of the Second World War enshrined in well-known international documents."

There is no doubt that the Maoists and the revanchists are still calculating on each other's support and are waiting for their hour to strike. Discontented with the policy of the present FRG government, which has normalised relations with socialist countries, the Peking leaders are all the more concerned with coming to terms with the Right-wing opposition on the Rhine. Incidentally, proof of the fact that contacts between these two forces continue is offered by Shih Tsien-pin's article.

So, why did Adenauer find it necessary to lie that certain propositions were made to him in Moscow in 1955? The reason is quite clear. On his part the leader of the German revanchists tried his best to incite the Maoists against the USSR. It is also clear why so many years later Adenauer's lie is again circulated by the Maoists. In the first place, they pervert history, yet again to vilify the Soviet Union. In the second place, they wish to conceal their secret deals with the West German reactionaries which were concluded in the 1950s and 1960s. In the third place, they want to reiterate Peking's readiness to participate in the collusion. As a matter of fact everything is being done in one way or another, with the help of all and any methods, to inhibit a detente in international relations.

Shih Tsien-pin ends his article with the following words: "We ought to adhere firmly to Chairman Mao's precept about the need to 'prepare for war, to prepare for disasters ... to dig deeper trenches'." Moreover, he directly

addresses himself to the Soviet Union when he writes: "Please, come, we will be glad to welcome you, the Chinese people are waiting for you." This is a barely disguised threat, a threat of aggression for which the Maoists are searching allies, any allies, in Western Europe.

But it is not for Shih Tsien-pin and his ilk to speak on behalf of the Chinese people. Life has demanded and will always demand peace and friendship between the USSR and the PRC. And neither books nor articles written with the pens of liars can change anything.

*1969-1974*

## 9. THE "GREAT MAN"

People have been talking about him for a long time. For a long time it has been almost impossible to pick up a newspaper or turn on the radio without seeing or hearing his name. The "great man" is in vogue. No politician in the past twenty years has elicited such ballyhoo and such glorification. Hour after hour and day after day millions of people in his country are told over and over again about his grandiose ideas, his deeds and his omniscience; about the millennia in terms of which he thinks, and about the perspicacity with which he rules the destinies of the world. He and he alone in the whole world, say his cronies and menials, is capable of this. The world has never known anyone like him.

The "great man" sits in his palace. He creates, he renders decisions, he rules. And when once in a very long while he appears before the people in a great square they fall into a frenzy at a signal. Hundreds of thousands shout in ecstatic voices, raise their arms and chant his name. He stands on a high platform, aloof from the people and looks down upon them, at times waving majestically to them. The square is a scene of public worship and he is gratified.

The "great man" thinks that that's how it will be for ever. He is convinced that there is no other way of making history. It seems that he already visualises himself as supreme ruler dictating his will to the world, proclaiming new laws for mankind and evoking fear and adoration.

He is an old man but in his heart of hearts he evidently regards himself immortal.

His vanity transcends all bounds; they say that it closely borders on obsession. It is not true that his cult is fostered only by his minions and lackeys; he takes a hand in this himself. He evidently revels in joy when he is compared with the sun, when he is called the all-seeing and the all-knowing, and experiences a voluptuous pleasure when his works are proclaimed "holy books" or a "magic encyclopaedia". He even quotes his own works. These are not traditional traits of rulers in that part of the world as some are inclined to believe: they are his own traits.

Many people are now trying to figure out who he actually is and how to qualify him. Some think that he simply commits blunders and that once he accidentally deviated from the correct path. This is not so. He always knew and knows what he is doing. Yet it is quite possible that now he lives and works in a sort of trance. It is hard to imagine the full extent of the egocentricity of such politicians. His city is the sole capital in the world, his country is the centre of the earth and he himself is unique and inimitable. Everything moves around him, everything is done for his sake and in obedience to his will. The thoughts of such individuals resemble hallucinations. Facts get mixed up with phantasmagorias in their consciousness, reality with mirages, people with ghostly robots, creatures without a will of their own, without a mind, without eyes and without a heart. Such, too, is the image of the "great man". There is no lack of them in our epoch. And having inhaled the fumes of political opium each of them strives to remake history and believes himself capable of doing so.

He is not only a megalomaniac, however. It is asserted that he is one of the most cruel figures ever to appear on the international scene; that he has no sense of justice towards people and no pity for them whatever. Socialist law is alien to him and he does not even want to know what it is. But the terror he instituted was not red terror directed against counter-revolutionaries. At the will of the



"great man" it was mainly communists who were put to death. This was anti-communist terror.

It has been estimated that millions of innocent people were exterminated in his country on his orders. Some were shot, others tortured to death, and still others beheaded. Hundreds of thousands died of "natural causes"–starvation or inhuman labour–just as in the SS camps in nazi Germany. According to Mao and his associates such was the price which had to be paid for "re-education". The best and the worthiest communists, heroes of the civil war in China, the pride of the Party and its old guard, were exterminated. And all this took place while he himself feasted in his palace and indulged in physical fitness exercises.

It is said that brutality has always been a distinctive trait of despots in his part of the world. Perhaps it was. But even so, where is it said or written that a person who calls himself a Marxist should emulate Tamerlane, Batu Khan or Shah Abbas?

Does the "great man" love anyone or anything apart from himself and the power he wields? Perhaps he loves his country and his people, if nothing else?

He says he does. But that, too, is a lie.

In his eyes his hundreds of millions of subjects are just so many slaves, so many obedient soldiers, so many kowtowing people whose bounden duty is to deify him. He had no qualms in dooming his compatriots to years of starvation and poverty. And there is no reason to doubt that he will unhesitatingly sacrifice them altogether to achieve his ambitions once he makes up his mind to do so.

He himself confirmed this in so many words when he said that nothing terrible would happen if one half of the population of his country perished in a thermonuclear war: other millions would be born. Does he and his attendance plan to hide in some remote caves in the event of such a war?

His apologists and certain servile Western journalists maintain that he is an astute and profound thinker. This is yet another legend.

It has been ascertained that much of what is printed in his "brilliant" and "magic" works is straight-out plagia-

rism. For instance, he claims to be the author of some important strategic and tactical ideas set forth in letters to the revolutionaries in China from their fellow revolutionaries abroad. He has also ascribed to himself the services that were rendered by military leaders who had worked with him. Evidently, in his opinion, such an attitude to others is his inalienable right. He and he alone is entitled to instruct and he alone has the right to think.

Having written nothing "epochal" himself, he hates the truly brilliant, world famous minds. He is jealous of Marx and cannot conceal his gnawing envy of Lenin. On his instructions such writers as Shakespeare, Balzac, Lev Tolstoy and Gorky, such poets as Homer, Dante and Heine, such composers as Beethoven, Mozart, Chaikovsky and Shostakovich, and such painters as Leonardo da Vinci, Rembrandt, Picasso and Siqueiros have been anathematised for ever in his country. He knows very little about these great men, but he hates all of them.

His attitude to almost all the leading writers, painters and musicians in his own country is exactly the same. He removes all cultural workers who refuse to live on their knees. "You can read many books, but that won't make you an emperor," he said on one occasion.

On another he declared: "From our point of view the intelligentsia is the most ignorant part of society." Several years later he added: "All artists, poets, playwrights, writers should be banished from the cities to the countryside. If they refuse to go to the masses then no food should be issued to them. Only those who go are to be fed."

He repudiates almost the whole of world culture for the simple reason that he was not its creator and because apart from a few faltering verses he added nothing to it. Neither Shakespeare nor Lev Tolstoy had predicted his advent. And it appears that he takes vengeance on them for failing to do so.

Is this lack of knowledge? Yes, but there is more to it. "Ignorance is a demon, we fear that it will yet be the cause of many a tragedy," wrote Marx.[1]

[1] Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1975, p. 202.



On top of everything the "great man" has a peculiar cast of mind, by no means typical of the ordinary people of his country. His speech is vulgar, but definitely not on ceremonial occasions and not in conversations with foreign journalists, for which he is specially prepared, and he thinks along vulgar lines. His closed and sometimes public orations are peppered with ugly comparisons. Holding forth on politics, for instance, he every now and then refers to the functions of the gastrointestinal tract and nothing seems to make him feel squeamish. Probably he regards this to be genuine, realistic thinking, and a materialistic method.

It could be said that all this does not matter a whit if the person in question is a politician involved in a large-scale gamble. But it does matter. The negative features in the character and cast of mind of a person who claims to be the "leader" of a nation are sure to be reflected in his political activity. It is impossible to overlook the morals and manners of political functionaries, least of all of those who have the nerve to call themselves revolutionaries.

And that's exactly what he calls himself. Millions of people still consider him a Communist. But was he ever a Communist?

This is indeed doubtful. There are many signs indicating that from the very beginning of his political career, the "great man" wore a mask. If, apart from the desire to attain unlimited personal power, he entertained some other idea, it was something exactly opposite to the idea of communism. This man is a fanatical nationalist, one of those standing very close to racialism.

Needless to say, he has never spoken nor ever will speak out aloud about such aims. A politician who professes to be a Communist cannot confess himself a chauvinist. But from the very outset he geared his policy to the attainment of his dream of standing at the head of a super-power that oppressed and absorbed other nations.

He wants to be the dictator of the world. In the past no one found anything surprising or unusual in such aspirations. Hundreds of emperors, tsars and princes who flooded

the world in blood dreamed of global empires. But for a person who has survived the times of Hitler such thoughts are wild and absurd, grotesque and incompatible with common sense. The "great man", however, thinks otherwise. The game he has been playing on the international scene for several years already hardly allows any other interpretations. He does not intend to build socialist society in his country–his associates have already announced that this task has been postponed for "one hundred years"–but seeks to establish hegemony over the entire continent. Take this into account and everything in his policy becomes clear. Everything else is unimportant to him.

It was not without the "great man's" participation that a history textbook, which is widely circulated in his country, included about a dozen other countries on the Asian continent into the former "state territory" of the power over which he rules. This is kept in great secrecy in his capital, and is known only to the privileged few. As can well be expected these people realise that it is still too early to come forward with great-power chauvinistic manifestoes. But in the past such thoughts, which in their author's mind mingled with an innate hatred for his country's northern neighbour, would manifest themselves in one way or another. For example, a person who visited his headquarters many years ago saw a portrait of Genghis Khan on a wall next to that of the "great man" himself. And when he asked who was portrayed on it he was told: "It is the portrait of an emperor of our country who also ruled Russia." Genghis Khan and he. That's the actual trend of the "great man's" thought.

On another occasion, in the course of a conversation with a newspaper correspondent, he spoke at length about a song lauding Japan's victory over tsarist Russia in the war of 1904-1905: "I still remember the charming words of this song.... In a way I felt the beauty of Japan and sympathised with its pride and might which are eulogised in this song dedicated to its victory over Russia." Could a Marxist for whom tsarism and Japanese militarism were equally detestable have spoken in such a manner? No, a Marxist would never say such a thing, but only a person



who regarded everything from the standpoint of extreme nationalism.

But one may also ask, how can all this be explained? If this man is so far away from communism then why are we talking about this only now? It is a fact that he joined the communist movement decades ago.

A logical question, to be sure, and one that requires an answer.

It is not always that a person, least of all a politician, shows his true colours from the very outset. This applies not only to bourgeois politicians, but also to people calling themselves communists. There is nothing good in that. Yet it is true. It often happens that such a politician wears a mask for years and even decades, a difficult but not an impossible task. All the features constituting the true essence of his character, thinking and motives become manifest after a certain period of time or when it is already too late. Of course, such people in masks are inordinately crafty and utterly without shame. And the man whom we are talking about is both. But sooner or later there comes a moment when such a person has to unmask himself. When that happens he exposes himself to the full.

Such people become renegades of all calibres. The international working-class movement, as any other revolutionary movement for that matter, has never been nor could have been ensured against them. It is necessary to be on the look-out for them and tear the mask off their faces as early as possible. But there are no absolute guarantees against them. A device which automatically exposes renegades has not yet been invented and never will be.

The "great man" hid his true face for a long time, very thoroughly and with undeniable skill. He is an adept in this. He certainly has a gift for acting and it can surely be applied in political activity. It is not surprising that such people have played and are continuing to play a role in history. Their names frequently occur in the chronicles of the feudal and capitalist formations.

There is another question about the "great man" which needs to be answered. It is a fairly important one in view

of the war hysteria which he has been fanning in his country for a very considerable period. His policy threatens the peace. But is he really as formidable as he appears to be? Is he at least capable of careful calculation, planning, assessing the alignment of forces? There are many politicians who are strategically minded without possessing either great ideas, integrity, pride of honesty. They know how to prepare an assault and achieve practical results. Is he one of them?

No. He's neither a competent strategist, nor a shrewd politician. All the positive traits, which he ascribes to himself, are above all the result of the heroic labour and immense sacrifices of his people, of millions of communists of his country. As a matter of fact he is incapable of long-term planning, of analysing the true alignment of forces and correctly appraising the adversary. He cannot judge when he will be forced to come to a halt. The road which he and his associates have elected to follow spells inevitable disaster.

He has always hated the Soviet Union, a state which helped his country to get rid of the imperialists and rise to its feet, and without whose friendship it has no future. There is likewise nothing surprising in the "great man's" stance towards the Soviet Union. Back in the 9th century the Chinese writer Li Shang-yin wrote: "Contemporaries who fall into folly entertain hostile feelings towards those who showed them great favour."

He is still full of threats. It is definitely necessary to be wary of him as of any other politician suffering from megalomania. He is a sinister personality. Holding sway over a vast country, he and his associates may eventually become dangerous. But then and perhaps even earlier disaster will strike. The "great man" will accomplish nothing great, but he is quite capable of playing on people's nerves and worsening the international situation.

Genghis Khan No. 2 has no *real* opportunities in the contemporary world where the alignment of forces has never been nor ever will be in his favour. Neither is he in a position to follow the nazi Rosenberg's recipe of "making the impossible possible". He will continue to make a



fuss and sow fear on the international arena, for such tactics form the basis of his foreign, as well as domestic policy. He has managed to remain at the top precisely thanks to the war hysteria. Yet noise-making will not alter the course of history and invective will not win battles. Evidently he realises this and consequently has no peace of mind. In some people lack of assurance affects not only their personal lives, but also their foreign policy. This has to be taken into account.

The "great man" is not a Genghis Khan even if he thinks otherwise. In the days when hordes of semi-barbarian horsemen invaded foreign countries the outcome of the struggle depended on the number of men armed with bows and arrows, on the tactic of the cavalry and the general military preparedness of a nation. In our day everything depends on technology, the economy and science of a highly developed country, and the ideological might of real socialism. Hence there will be no more victorious Genghis Khans.

The "great man" wants to become a colossus. What wouldn't he give to make this dream come true. But it never will. A truly great man needs above all a great and historically justified idea. This man has no such idea. It is not a great idea, but a crime to hurl one's people into the flames of a suicidal policy. Sooner or later he will reap retribution.

Shakespeare has the following lines in *Richard the Second:*

> "For within the hollow crown
> That rounds the mortal temples of a king
> Keeps Death his court, and there the antic sits,
> Scoffing his court and grinning at his pomp;
> Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
> To monarchise, be fear'd and kill with looks,
> Infusing him with self and vain conceit
> As if this flesh which walls about our life
> Were brass impregnable; and humour'd thus
> Comes at the last, and with a little pin
> Bores through his castle wall, and farewell king!"

Shakespeare wrote about death in its physical form. It stalks all men. But kings, like emperors, can suffer a political death. And such a death strikes renegades.

There is yet another thing that should not be overlooked. By birth this man belongs to a certain nationality. Yet no one, no one in the whole world should identify him with his compatriots. Such figures as he are not typical of any nation. It is only outwardly that he resembles a worker, peasant or intellectual of his country. He professes to speak on their behalf, and rules them at present. But they are not him. In effect he has divorced himself from his people a long time ago.

There is no saying when his people will divorce itself from him. There is no saying how much longer he and his associates will continue to clamour, threaten the whole world and profane socialism. But we do know that he will not succeed in becoming the world's hegemon. The "great man" is too small.

*1970*

## 10. MAO'S LONG-TERM PLAN

It would have been meaningless if I wrote this article guided solely by a feeling of bitterness or irritation, for nothing serious would have come of it. Bitterness is rarely an asset in a political study, irritation–even less so. I have only one wish: calmly and methodically to trace the chain of facts in the light of China's present foreign policy, ascertain their logical meaning and draw the logical conclusions, however strange or unusual they may appear. That's the only way of seriously pondering international politics.

As we all know, they should neither be ignored nor underestimated, and today more than ever before in spite of detente. Life has taught Soviet people who have made unprecedented sacrifices and attained unprecedented achievements within the lifetime of a single generation to pay the greatest attention to international problems. And the events of the last third of the current century do not in the least warrant a relaxation of vigilance. All of us feel this. The forces barring the way to progress are still active and things are much more complicated than one would imagine. Marxists have always known that they should be prepared for ever fresh and not always predictable developments. Therein lies their strength.

Modern history, which is witnessing a decisive turning point on the eve of a global transition to a new society, confronts people with ever new problems. At times it veers

off at such angles and creates such complications which no historian could have ever predicted, just like no one before Einstein's time could have predicted the advent of the current atomic and cosmic age. Nevertheless, now, too, it is necessary to look ahead, boldly and fearlessly, as Lenin has always demanded when contemplating international affairs.

A great deal has been said about China of late, perhaps more than ever before. Some people thought that upon the completion of the "cultural revolution" the ruling grouping in Peking would become firmly lodged in power and no sensational news could be expected from there. In the West it was almost unanimously asserted that the foreign policy of Chunnanghai, the palatial residence of the PRC chairman, has entered a more tranquil, "even" course.

But suddenly a mysterious internal crisis erupts in the PRC and some of the most prominent Maoist functionaries become its victims. The Chinese press is silent. A few months pass and the world public is shocked by yet another development. China openly sides with the imperialists against the people of Bangladesh who are fighting for their freedom. Acting in collusion with the opponents of national liberation movements, the PRC endeavours to stab Bangladesh in the back. Peking is against the national liberation movement in Asia. And once again Chinese policy creates a commotion in the world.

What are they after in Chunnanghai palace? Whereto tends this policy?

Being an historian I think I am entitled to express my views on this issue.

They have been playing diplomatic ping-pong in Peking of late. There is nothing wrong in that. Political ball tossing is an ancient diplomatic tradition. Mr. Nixon's visit to Peking has given rise to speculation about an improvement in Chinese-American relations. This is also praiseworthy, if, of course, it promotes the cause of peace. The more friendly bonds are established on this planet, the greater the benefit for all peoples, including the Chinese, the American and the Soviet people.



This is self-evident and, therefore, requires no elucidation. To pursue a policy in defence and consolidation of peace in our epoch is law No. 1 for any nation, and no one, no one at all, has the right to violate it. Whoever breaks this law assumes the most terrible responsibility which has ever rested on anybody. Contemporary humanity cannot do without a normalisation and improvement of international relations. This applies in equal measure to such powers as the PRC and the USA. Peaceful coexistence between them is no less essential than between all the other great powers.

That is why the Soviet Union would have welcomed a genuine detente in the relations between Peking and Washington. For years the USSR worked to have the PRC admitted to the UN, to get Taiwan, which was seized by Chiang Kai-shek with American aid, returned to China, to get the West to lift its restrictions on trade with China, and, in general, to secure recognition of the right of the great Chinese people to occupy their rightful place in the world. But will it be the place of a great power with equal rights with all others, or the place of a hegemonic super-power? Is it a question of strengthening universal peace with the active participation of China, or of a new form of aggressive chauvinism, this time Chinese?

This is worth figuring out, though not on the basis of ping-pong or diplomatic speeches and notes, but in the light of cold facts.

There is plenty of material to go by, and a researcher can examine the main issue quite objectively. He can do this, as we have said above, without irritation and vehemence and, at least, without the abuse which still fills the pages of the Peking press and Peking radio broadcasts whenever the USSR is mentioned.

One can never say exactly what the future has in store: it is wilful and frequently introduces unexpected corrections into forecasts. But anyone is entitled to examine what already exists.

A careful study of Maoist foreign policy over the past years, beginning with the period preceding the "cultural revolution" leads one to the conclusion that the following

ten points make up its main content, its quintessence as a long-term programme:

1. To create before the end of the current century a new great Asian "system" under the "socialist" flag, with a vast territory, enormous demographic resources and a great nuclear-missile potential, but with a low standard of life and without going ahead with the construction of a real socialist society.

2. Gradually, through collusion with imperialists of all brands, to help invest the socialist system in Europe from the East and West and, if possible, from the South.

3. To undermine the unity of the world communist movement and simultaneously corrupt and blow up the cohesion of the world socialist community from within.

4. To camouflage this policy by playing a double game: one with the national liberation movement in the developing regions under the slogan of "encircling the town with the world village", that is, by staking on the peasantry, and the other with individual states under the slogan of resisting the "hegemony" of the two "super-powers"–the USA and the USSR–that is, staking on diplomatic coalitions involving aggressive China with different countries.

5. Without compunction, either covertly or overtly, to betray the national liberation movement whenever this act may appear to be advantageous to its great-Han diplomacy.

6. Systematically, day in and day out, in secret and even openly to aggravate the international situation, electrify the atmosphere in each "local" seat of tension and create on various continents–Asia, Africa, Europe and America–new hotbeds of tension thus hindering peaceful settlement, blasting the chances for promoting disarmament and fanning the flames of conflict.

7. Wherever and whenever possible to incite the USA and NATO against the USSR, organise provocations under any pretext and at every opportunity without stopping short of anything.

8. To take advantage of an explosion-fraught moment in international developments and try to push the two systems (the NATO countries and members of the Warsaw



Treaty organisation) into the flames of a world thermonuclear war and watch it blaze from the sidelines.

9. After such a destructive war which, according to Maoist calculations, should result in the extermination of hundreds of millions of people outside China, to establish the latter's hegemony over the world.

10. Thereupon to start the Maoisation of the surviving part of humanity according to methods already being practised in the PRC itself.

Such, according to a whole range of data, including statements published by Maoists, is the cherished, long-term foreign policy plan of the most extreme group in Peking, or at least such are its main contours. Perhaps some of my conclusions will not be confirmed. But then nothing could be better. Today, however, I firmly believe that there are many, very many indications that these are the Chunnanghai's long-term foreign policy objectives.

The reader, one can imagine, is stunned finding all this hard to believe. It is as though he is reading a blood-chilling and rather primitive science-fiction novel and not a political programme of a large state which, moreover, calls itself socialist. Still it would be a mistake to underestimate this programme and throw it off the scales.

The Maoists' great-power chauvinistic policy did not accidentally mature in the minds of certain people in Peking and cannot be regarded as a fruit of their morbid imagination. Things are much more serious. Historically, this programme is rooted in the aggressive policy of the Chinese emperors and the age-old great-Han "sinocentrism".[1] But now "sinocentrism" is reviving in contemporary conditions and is trying to employ contemporary resources obtained at the expense of a vast country. Today its impellent is the PRC leadership, those who reneged on Marxism, stopped the revolution in their country and, exploiting its backwardness, have subjected the people to their despotism. Such zigzags always avenge themselves. Having occurred in domestic policy they naturally give rise to a per-

[1] A concept of China as the hegemonic centre of the world.–*Ed.*

verted, ominous foreign policy. The one inevitably stems from the other.

It is another question whether the objectives of this foreign policy are indeed tenable. One cannot deny that it has a degree of "logical" consistency, for taken together all its points form an integral whole. Yet it is clear to all normal and sensible people that this is the "logic" of depravity, and that depravity too can have its own logic is a fact known not only to psychiatrists.

It is clear that this programme is unrealistic and impracticable in our day, in spite of the tenacity and the Jesuitical cunning which may be employed by those who want to translate it into reality. There is no doubt that political adventurism heated up to such a degree will eventually consume itself. There is no doubt that people who conceive such plans must reckon with views of sober-minded statesmen. But the sober-minded reader of the 1970s should, nevertheless, recall certain facts.

It was not so very long ago that either he or his parents, his country and the whole world suffered an unprecedented tragedy resulting from similar or very similar monstrous plans and insane political projects. This tragedy cost the world 50 million in dead and hundreds of millions of wrecked lives. Many of those who managed to survive have been unable to recover from it to this day. One should not think that by now history has fully wiped out political epilepsy and got rid of phenomena which one day our descendants will regard as incredible nightmares. The reality of society which has bridled the energy of the atom, mastered chemical synthesis and the dynamics of missiles but has not yet passed the stage of barbaric imperialism, racialism and ultra-nationalism has by far outstripped the imagination of H. G. Wells. The barbaric past lives on and acts side by side with the great humane strength of the present. Often it is necessary to speak about this contradiction for which all of us are still paying. So far, however, the world continues to remain in its clutches and we are fighting to overcome it.

Of course, the above foreign political course of the Maoists is not a programme for the immediate future; it



is a long-term project designed to cover decades. We should like to emphasise this once again for a publicist and historian is entitled to look so far ahead even in his most ordinary articles. But the long-term nature of the adventuristic plans originating in the minds of certain people does not make it less necessary to keep a wary eye on them already today. Every thinking person must carefully ponder the foreign policy of the Mao group, and not only for the immediate future. It is necessary to have a clear idea what *in the final analysis* is Peking's ultimate objective, and what is the true purpose of the Maoist ventures. When reading the latest reports from Peking it is necessary to bear in mind all the ten points of the Maoists' programme and not merely their ping-pong games.

What is most important is that under no circumstances should one think that the end or a pause in the "cultural revolution" signifies a repudiation of this foreign policy programme. On the contrary. Now it is being implemented with even greater tenacity. What, after all, have they learned in Peking in the past few years? Typical yet decrepit Machiavellianism. Apparently, Maoist diplomats think that they are the most crafty of pragmatists for whom principles are nothing and practical success is everything. They imagine that they move the pawns on the international chessboard more wisely and skilfully than anyone else. Yet pragmatism is not political realism.

It is true that for some time now these cherished long-term plans are not mentioned, at least out loudly, in the PRC capital. This would be neither opportune nor correct from the tactical point of view. Yet somewhere backstage, in the secret vaults of political, military, subversive and propaganda agencies, the programme drawn up back in the 1950s and "perfected" and updated in the 1960s is still on the agenda. Its authors may argue about certain details and suggest that some of its subsections should be modified, or "modernised". But its essence is left alone. The idea of building a great Chinese super-power continues to dominate minds in Chunnanghai. Reality confirms this day after day, month after month. For instance, Peking's flirtation with the imperialist powers is designed to further this pro-

gramme. It is not difficult to chart the contours of Peking's projected Maoist super-power on the basis of information from Chinese sources and generally known facts.

Is it true that Peking is really dreaming of creating a super-power? Is it possible that people, who were in the communist movement for decades and were even among the leaders of the people's revolution in China, have become the continuers of a policy once pursued by Chinese feudal rulers? Many people in the world are sincerely and anxiously asking these questions. Among them are communists and the proponents of the most diverse views. It is indeed difficult to believe that this is so.

We know only too well that the term "hegemonic power" is a new term for "empire". Empires were conceived and built, raged and collapsed ever since class society came into being. Each epoch had its avaricious classes and megalomaniacs obsessed with the idea of seizing other countries, vanquishing other peoples and proclaiming themselves masters of super-powers. This was the case under Hammurabi and Nebuchadnezzar, under Alexander the Great and Caesar, under the Palaeologues of Byzantium and the Mongol Chingisides, under the Carolingians and Napoleon, and recently under Hitler and Dulles. Among the empire-builders there were slaveowners, feudal lords and the placemen of financial capital. But never in history was the creation of an aggressive world empire planned by a state calling itself revolutionary and socialist. Priority here definitely belongs to the Maoists.

Until recently they barely concealed their plans, though for the sake of the public they shrouded them in almost "poetic" forms. "The great socialist China stands in all its gigantic height in the east of the globe," wrote *Jenmin jihpao*, clearly intimating that China's shadow was beginning to shroud the West, too. On another occasion it was bluntly stated in Peking: "The entire globe is a picture which shows that the wind from the East is swelling while the wind from the West is diminishing." A Peking official declared: "We shall gaze proudly at the five continents." And *Jenmin jihpao* echoed: "Today's China is the morrow of the whole world."



But the foundation of the entire edifice should under all circumstances be in the East. The slogan "Asia for the Asians", under China's aegis, needless to say, is still current in Peking. The initiated Maoists regard the idea of creating a new great-Asian super-power within the boundaries of Genghis Khan's empire and even beyond them as being absolutely natural and timely. The *Sinkiangshe* journal wrote the following prior to the so-called cultural revolution: "It would be wrong to regard territorial expansion as aggression and to proclaim weak and dying nationalities objects of aggression and sympathise with them. The actions of a powerful nation or state designed to enlarge its territory are in keeping with the laws of social development of its time."[1] This is not a quotation from *Mein Kampf*. It conveys the unuttered thoughts of Maoist leaders.

Moreover, the matter went beyond the publication of these statements in Chinese newspapers and journals. According to the "Map of China in the Period of Its Supreme Might", which was published in the PRC some time ago for the edification of the Chinese, China's legitimate territory embraces not only the whole of Asia, but a considerable part of Europe as well, that is, all countries which had been invaded at one time or another by the Mongolian conquerors. Both Batu Khan and Genghis Khan were declared to be Chinese, and even progressive Chinese. Genghis Khan, a despot who flooded a whole continent in blood and dreamt of doing the same to another was called an "emperor of China" who played a "progressive role in the history of China in general" and in "another forty states".[2]

These are documents and not conjectures or deductions. Such statements, or arguments designed to substantiate them, could have filled a whole volume, let alone a short article. But perhaps more proof is needed. So let us trace more thoroughly the contours of the Asian super-power which Genghis Khan's contemporary disciples in the PRC capital are dreaming about. Facts indicate that at present

---

[1] *Sinkiangshe*, No. 1, 1962, p. 52.

[2] *Historical Science in the PRC*, Moscow, 1971, p. 47 (in Russian).

the Maoist headquarters have determined three main directions for the projected expansion: south, southwest and north of Peking.

It is not along all these lines that Peking politicians are conducting or planning to conduct an offensive at one and the same time and not always with equal determination and aggressiveness. Their strategy and tactics change with the circumstances; there is the right time both for the whip and for the carrot.

But the main direction, at present, according to the views prevailing in Peking is the south. Maoist strategists maintain that the salient on the Asian continent extending from the South China Sea to the Bay of Bengal is the key to the creation of their great-Han "system". Naturally, for the present it is not a question of a forcible seizure of Southeast Asia by China–even the Peking fanatics so far have no hallucinations of this kind–but of creating some sort of a durable Maoist "sphere of influence" there.

The important thing is not only that that part of Asia is the home of hundreds of millions of hardworking people, including millions of ethnic Chinese, and that it has incalculable deposits of crucial raw materials, among them oil, rubber, tin, nickel, and of course, ricefields. Their main consideration is that politically and strategically Southeast Asia is one of the most important regions in the world. It is there that the future of the world national liberation movement may be decided to a considerable degree and it is a region which can play a great role in altering the alignment of military forces in the Pacific and Indian oceans.

One way or another, the transformation of this zone into a special "inviolable" sphere of Maoist China's influence would, according to its leaders, promptly turn the PRC into a super-power. That's the aim towards which Peking has been working for many years, and not only without reckoning with the will of the peoples inhabiting that region, but even counter to their clearly expressed desire to attain state sovereignty and independence. Any argument and any method is used to carry out and justify such a policy.



The Southeast Asian states are "entered" into the Chinese sphere of influence on the basis of certain historical "traditions" and legends going back to the Middle Ages and even further into the depths of centuries. For instance, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and also Thailand, Burma and other independent states are regarded as one-time vassals of the Chinese emperors which China is allegedly "duty-bound" to protect and instruct. Peking simply ignores the fact that their peoples do not share this point of view. In general the Maoists completely disregard the rights and aspirations of the Asian peoples and other fundamental issues. Their sole concern is the establishment of their hegemony in Asia. A leading Southeast Asia statesman, for example, said in 1967 that the PRC questions the right of his sovereign state to be the master of its country. The following year he added that the Maoists were in a state of exaltation and trance–possessed as under nazism.

Sometimes Peking acts even more primitively and employs force without resorting to persuasion and references to history. For years on end plots were hatched and adventuristic uprisings were organised in Southeast Asian countries. All of them, as a rule, led only to bloodshed and suffering. The military putsch in Indonesia inspired by pro-Maoist elements in September 1965, which was designed to result in the creation of a "Jakarta-Peking axis", led not only to the rout of the 3.5-million-strong Communist Party of Indonesia and the annihilation of hundreds of thousands of the most devoted communists, but also to the coming to power of rightist generals, and the shift of Indonesia, formerly a non-aligned country, towards the West. Here the Maoists' imperial plan turned against the vital interests of the communist movement. Unsuccessful, sporadic armed uprisings inspired from Peking followed one another for years on end in Burma, Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines, but they only drained the heroic guerrilla groups of their revolutionary forces. Yet the signal to stop these ventures did not come from the PRC capital.

The following figures disclose the purely demographic significance which the Maoists attach to the Southeast Asian "sphere of influence". The aggregate area and popu-

lation of the eight states forming this zone–Indonesia, Burma, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines–is equal to nearly 3,500,000 sq. km. with 240 million inhabitants. This is more than a third of the territory of present-day China. They are evidently just as anxious under one guise or another to turn that vast area into a satellite of the great-Han state, as the slaveowners, feudal lords and capitalist magnates wanted in their time to form their own kingdoms. That is why the zone's projectors in Peking are still obsessed by their expansionist aspirations.

The attitude in Chunnanghai to the central part of South Asia, between the Himalayas and the Indian Ocean, is somewhat different but still typically hegemonic. Here the main stress is laid on undermining the positions of the neutral Asian states for the sole purpose of removing them from the great-power chauvinist path of the Maoists. In that area the Peking strategists employ another "classical" method of their great-power policy, that of inciting one country against another.

For a long time the spearhead of Maoist policy in that part of the world has been directed against Asia's leading neutral state–vast India with its population of more than 500 million. Several years ago it was not simply a matter of involving India in a major drawn-out war with its northern neighbour in order to weaken and exhaust the former, but of having the door to the Indian sub-continent open to China itself when the right moment arrived. Hence Peking's repeated offers to Pakistan to establish relations of "eternal friendship" with the PRC and at the same time the rather strange promise as far as the Maoists are concerned not to include Pakistan into the "zone of revolutionary storms".[1] That explains why in the summer and autumn of 1965, during the Indo-Pakistani conflict over Kashmir (at the time when the Maoists were hatching their plot in Indonesia) Peking offered Pakistan "every assistance" at "any time" and issued an ultimatum to India which was intended to foment the conflict between China

[1] *PRC Foreign Policy*, Moscow, 1971, p. 105 (in Russian).



and India in the Himalayas in the area of Kashmir. The purpose of all these moves was to force India to its knees. We know that the big war in the Himalayas was averted thanks to the mediation of the USSR which arranged an Indo-Pakistani meeting in Tashkent. We also know however, that passions in Peking have not abated since then. And that accounts for the fact that during the Indo-Pakistani conflict in December 1971 Peking made every effort to fan this conflict into a real conflagration.

Military and strategic bases for striking blows at India are either being built or projected at least in half a dozen directions. With PRC assistance a highway has been built linking the Pakistani part of Kashmir with Sinkiang in China near the Indian border. As a result the Chinese are now able to move their troops from Kashgar to Gilgit near the Indian border within a few hours and then in a few more hours to transfer them to Leh, 650 kilometres from Delhi.[1] The Karakoram Railway connecting the PRC with Pakistan in the same area was put in operation in February 1971. Still earlier the Katmandu-Kodari road, which can be used to transfer Chinese troops to India from Tibet, was completed.

According to some reports the PRC had even tried to set up a Chinese naval base directed against India from the south. A noteworthy fact is that the Maoist General Staff in many respects copies the anti-Indian dispositions of the Japanese General Staff during the Second World War. Quite probably this accounts for the Maoists' special concern for building medium-range missiles which could reach India. Hence, although in a different plane, Peking's unceasing incitement of local uprisings which flared up in their time in the north of India, close to the borders with China and Pakistan. Similar adventuristic operations were conducted by pro-Maoist groups under diverse "leftist" flags in India's neighbour, Burma, too, where there are more than a million ethnic Chinese. At one time efforts were made to goad Pakistan into attacking peace-loving and neutral Afghanistan.

[1] *Organiser*, Delhi, May 26, 1968.

Let's take a look further west from the Himalayas. The Arab East is also in the focus of attention of the Maoist headquarters. It would appear that that part of the world, lying as it does thousands of kilometres from China, has never had any vassal, racial or religious relations with it. Yet, the Arab East, too, is regarded by specialists in Peking as an inalienable sphere of influence of their projected "system". They believe there are good reasons for this.

Firstly, the Arab countries must supply this "system" with unlimited quantities of oil, in which it experiences the greatest shortage at present. Secondly, the Middle East is important because it is the extreme western flank of the projected super-power: from the side of the Persian Gulf, the Mediterranean, the Black and the Caspian seas. All these plans are undoubtedly a part of the major, "global" anti-Soviet strategy which has been formulated in these circles. Hence the Maoists' interminable efforts to torpedo a peaceful Middle East settlement at all costs (just as was the case at the UN General Assembly in December 1971), and firmly hitch the more extremist functionaries of the Palestine movement to their chariot. It has become known that China even plans to replace the British on the west coast of the Persian Gulf. Unquestionably the Peking arch-strategists realise that it is more difficult to attain their objectives there than in any other part of Asia. But they have not abandoned their long-term plans for launching a political offensive against the Arab lands.

Only British imperialism had pursued such an aggressive and truly frenzied policy in West, Central and South Asia. It looks as though the annexationist activities of the Anglo-Asian sahibs and of the Japanese militarists is being very carefully studied in present-day Peking. One thing is clear, however: in Peking they intend to surpass even the Hastings, Curzons and Tojos.

We spoke about the PRC's expansionist plans in the south and west of Asia. There is no reason to dwell on another projected direction of their expansion, to the north. Judging by everything such dispositions are kept mainly in reserve in the event of the realisation of the most important and secret, "global" strategy of Peking's Machiavellis.



There can be only one answer to the question: Who wants to become a super-power? This is confirmed by extremely convincing facts. Events again and again reinforce the conclusions. No "ideological" tags and ultra-Left signboards which are displayed all the time can conceal what is becoming more and more conspicuous even to the naked eye. Our contemporaries have been trained to look upon things realistically and seldom let smokescreens blank out their vision. But we have yet to answer another and, perhaps, the most important question. How do they in Peking visualise the creation of their projected hegemonic super-power? How, contrary to the will of the peoples and to the current alignment of forces, do the Maoists plan to subjugate at least Asia alone from the Pacific Ocean to the Persian Gulf?

In the long run, as we all know, it is not oral proclamations, not roars designed to scare "paper tigers" and not even backstage conspiracies, that decide the issue. China has an enormous demographic potential, but its economic capacity is still relatively weak, particularly for such a task as the attainment of its fantastic foreign policy objectives. Although its military capability is growing at the expense of the vital needs of the people, the outlook is not in favour of the aggressors. Have the Maoists any chance for success in such conditions?

The extremists in their ranks evidently think that they have. And that after all is what their "supreme", "global" foreign policy is being built on. It would be interesting to give some thought to this, too.

We spoke about the Maoist project to create a new super-power before the century is out. If all the countries and territories which Peking intends, either openly or secretly, to include in the sphere of influence of this super-power in Asia alone are grouped together, then with the PRC, but without Japan, the Middle and Near East, and any Soviet territories, they would comprise a conglomerate of 19 million square kilometres with a population, according to the latest figures, of 2,000 million, or twice as large as the PRC in area and almost three times in population.

The bulk of the world's population would be included in this system.

These figures should not be treated lightly. Such a power had never existed in the world. Having subjected dozens of Asian states and threatening others on different continents with a thermonuclear tornado, it could, with obsessed politicians at its helm, attempt to become a world hegemon, just as the Third Reich endeavoured to attain world ascendancy in the 1930s and 1940s.

A fantastic idea? Undoubtedly. The Maoists have not and never will have the strength and the possibilities for achieving such an objective. But the author who has repeatedly dwelt on such subjects and plans would like to say once again: don't be surprised. In the 20th century, probably the last one preceding humanity's transition to a new society, one can expect anything from those who aspire to unlimited power over the people.

It is one thing to devise political phantasies and another to turn them into reality. Such a despotic, aggressive power could be built only if all other states and peoples would be either totally paralysed or fully obedient to the will of China. There is no other possibility. The days of Genghis Khan ended seven centuries ago. What could bring about a situation that would enable China to go ahead with its plans? Only one thing—a major, destructive thermonuclear war in which China would not be involved.

Today it is no longer a secret that top-ranking Maoist circles not only dream but at times directly speak about the need, or "inevitability" of precisely such a war. Moreover, it is a fact that during the past 15 years Peking systematically tried to draw the Soviet Union and other socialist countries into a thermonuclear war.

Let's peruse the pages of latest history and recall what took place before our eyes. Such events should not be forgotten.

1957. The Soviet Union launches the first ever sputnik. In those days Mao Tse-tung offers to interrupt socialist construction and suggests a test of strength. Speaking at the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow he asseverates that this will benefit socialism and that



it isn't at all necessary to be deterred by the threat of one half of mankind being killed in another world war. Within fifty or a hundred years after such a war, he says, "the population will again increase and by even more than a half".[1]

1958. The Chinese Government orders its army to mount a "punitive expedition" in the Taiwan Straits and begin a massive artillery bombardment of the offshore islands of Matsudao and Chinmendao occupied by Chiang Kai-shek's troops. Contrary to the general principles governing relations between socialist countries, Peking issues this order without consulting the Soviet Government. The US command promptly reinforces and alerts its group of forces in that part of the world. Later it comes to light that when deciding to mount this operation the Maoist leaders took into account that it could lead to a "local war" in which atomic weapons would be used so that at one stage or another the USSR would become involved in it.

1959. The Maoists lead their conflict with India to a direct armed clash in the Himalayas. They hope that the then Indian Government would turn to the US for military assistance while China would have the support of the USSR.

1960. Another Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties takes place in Moscow. In his speech the Maoist representative demands that the policy of peaceful coexistence should be rejected and replaced by a policy of balancing "on the brink of war", and that a "decisive" battle should be given imperialism. At the same time the socialist countries are urged to strengthen China's military and strategic capability.

1962. The Caribbean crisis which has erupted as a result of US aggressive plans with regard to Cuba may at any moment develop into a world-wide military conflict. At this moment Peking resumes and broadens hostilities against India, so that there is a threat of a major war in that part of the world. This is done in the hope that the

---

[1] *Pravda*, September 22, 1963.

USSR will have to give up its peaceful coexistence policy and will be drawn into a clash with the USA.

1965. The war in Vietnam against US intervention rages on with increasing intensity. The Soviet Union does its utmost to help the Vietnamese with matériel. The Chinese leaders do their utmost to prevent the transit of military freight from socialist countries to Vietnam through China. This is done in order to make the USSR send it by sea and thus provoke incidents between Soviet ships and the US 7th Fleet cruising in the Indian Ocean. Fresh efforts are made to fan a big war in South Asia and somehow inveigle the Soviet Union in it.

We have cited several concrete facts. Each one of them is recorded in history and cannot be disputed. The Soviet Union has successfully avoided all traps.

Such is the essence of the plan devised by the extremists in Peking, such is the road which, they hope, will enable them to translate their idea of creating a great-Han superpower into reality. They could not care less for the lot of "one half of mankind".

But for those who regard these arguments as inadequate, and from my own experience I know that there are more than enough people who always seem to want more facts, I can add something else.

Do the extremists in Peking conceal their intentions to plunge the world into a thermonuclear war and at the same time to preserve something in the nature of a demographic and military and technological nucleus in China with which to attain their hegemonic ambitions? Not always. In 1965 Mao Tse-tung talked with the American journalist Edgar Snow whom he frequently used as his mouthpiece. Here is what he wrote with Mao's approval after their conversation: "You have been quoted as saying that other peoples might be totally wiped out, but China would still have a few hundred millions left to begin anew."[1]

One thing should be clarified, however. The American journalist might think that China still intends to participate in a world thermonuclear war. Yet no one can say for

[1] *The New Republic*, February 27, 1965, p. 19.



sure that this is what Mao Tse-tung intends to do. The substance of the Maoists' foreign policy plans was expressed with greater precision in 1963 by the Italian journal *Epoca*, whose observer Augusto Guerriero wrote that in the event of an atomic conflict the warring sides would endeavour to destroy each other but "the Chinese would remain on the sideline. In the long run China ... would become the ruler of a world lying in ruins".

The Italian journalist understood the Maoist plans better than the American did. That and no other is the future which is being projected by the chauvinists in Peking. But it is a different future that awaits Peking, however, and not only because the PRC will find it impossible to remain out of reach of the fire and radiation of a world thermonuclear war. Those who think that it will are either blind or on the verge of insanity. The main thing is that the socialist community will never fall into a trap set either by the imperialists or by the betrayers of the socialist cause.

It looks as though now there are people in Peking who are coming to realise this. Could this account for the fact that they are searching so diligently for other ways of attaining the old aim? Could this account for the fact that Peking is trying hard to talk various capitalist countries into entering anti-Soviet blocs or alliances? Since they have failed to involve the USSR in a thermonuclear war, then perhaps it would prove possible to force the capitalist powers onto this road sometime in the future? Peking does not seem to care who begins as long as the desired result is achieved.

Their aim is always the same—to start a conflagration which would envelop the greater part of the world. On the basis of available facts it is possible to speak even about the Maoist plans to help stimulate attempts to "encircle" the USSR from different directions in collusion with the most rabid imperialists. But this is a matter which requires a separate study.

Is this blindness or madness?

We know that the Maoists today, too, years after the "cultural revolution" call themselves extreme "Left"-wing

communists, that they proclaim Peking "the centre of the world revolution", talk about "sinecised Marxism" and so forth. Then how can they simultaneously speak up in favour of creating a chauvinist super-power under their domination? Ostensibly nothing of the sort is being done in Peking, for it pursues its great-power chauvinistic policy behind a mask, or rather several masks.

Empires have almost always worn "ideological" masks. It was easy to devise them. The robber emperors of feudal Europe of the Middle Ages swore that they were the servants of Christ and were obedient only to the will of God. Muslim sultans who invaded Europe said that they were guided by the teaching of Mohammed, and conquered foreign countries in order to convert the unbelievers. Chinese feudal emperors proclaimed China the centre of the earth; Hitler carried on his grim work under the cover of the theory of the superiority of the Aryan "race of masters"; Dulles proclaimed the advent of the "American era" and one hundred per cent anti-communism.

The builders of the Maoist "system" follow the old rule. But their signboard is painted to suit the latest tastes. The Chinese leaders started out by proclaiming themselves heads of the "world village" which surrounds and vanquishes the "world town", i.e., the highly advanced industrial countries (including socialist ones). According to this theory it was not the Peking chauvinistic politicians, but the deprived revolutionary peasants of the whole world who wanted to create a new super-power. And there are people who believe this.

Hundreds of speeches were made and thousands of articles were written in Peking on this subject which was proclaimed a new revelation of Marxism. There is no need to delve into it. Suffice it to say that the "peasant" mask is just as precariously perched on the faces of the great-Han theoreticians as was the mask of Christianity on the faces of the Medieval Carolingians, Hohenstaufens and Hapsburgs. Peking lies deliberately.

It is true that the peasants in the majority of Asian, African and Latin American countries have for centuries been tormented by poverty and for the most part eke out



a half-hungry existence. It is true that in some countries on these continents the peasants play a very important role in the revolutionary national liberation movement and that tomorrow, in alliance with the working class, they may come to play an even greater part in it. It is also true that the Maoists need the peasants in Asia, Africa and Latin America only in the capacity of obedient soldiers, or at best, as mercenaries. Peking "theoreticians" estimate that the peasants will make up a substantial part of those hundreds of millions of people whose death will be inevitable or "essential" in Mao Tse-tung's world thermonuclear war.

The idea of a great peasant revolution which it is claimed will "encircle" and crush the "repleted" highly industrialised countries is a mask. It is not, in spite of Peking's teaching, "an Asian form of Marxism". It is a cover for the latest form of great-power hegemonism. The PRC's stance during the slaughter of communists in Sudan and during the events of 1971 on the Hindustan Peninsula, when the Maoists virtually stuck a knife in the back of the Bangladesh people, dispelled all doubts concerning the Maoists' ability to betray popular movements in the newly free countries at any time.

The second mask sits even more precariously. It is donned when the PRC starts a game this time with the leaders of individual states irrespective of their social system but which it wants to draw to its side. Peking tells them that China is a disinterested defender of weak nations, and of all countries in general, against two others–the USA and the USSR. In such cases Peking forgets all about classes. And though America personifies imperialism and the USSR, socialism, the one and the other are accused with equal passion of hegemonism, which is precisely the cherished goal of the Maoists themselves.

And here what has always been a typical feature of chauvinistic politicians of all nationalities, namely their hypocrisy, strikes the eye. It is true that the "hawks" in the USA have always aspired to and, so long as they are alive, will continue to aspire to world hegemony. But how can this trait be ascribed to a power which claims no

foreign territory, which has a great nuclear capability but which for years has been offering to ban nuclear weapons, a power whose foreign policy rests wholly on the idea of peaceful coexistence of all nations, on their equality and independence? And how can those who themselves intend to create a power which would surpass Europe twice in territory and three times in population accuse someone else of "super-power" ambitions?

Impossible, or so it seems. But in this case logic is thrown overboard. Chinese diplomats now don the mask of "defenders of the weak" in order to entice the more credulous and less wary politicians abroad into following their cue. Sooner or later they will discard this mask too, but historical experience shows that it might be too late for those who will fall victim to such a policy.

"No misfortune is greater than ignorance of the limits of one's own passions," said the ancient Chinese philosopher Lao-tse. It seems to us that officials in China, those of them who are still capable of normal political thinking, should ponder these words.

It should be understood that betrayal of socialism is not a betrayal which has no aftermath. As a rule it leads to an incurable political decomposition and, in the final analysis, to political suicide. Even in the fumes of the personality cult it is impossible to discard ideas like gloves and to move from Marxism directly to great-power hegemonism.

We have examined only the foreign policy of the PRC. It is absolutely clear, and we say once again, that the plans of its present rulers are unrealistic in the final analysis. In view of the present-day alignment of forces in the world they are even less practicable than were Hitler's maniacal ideas. The world does not need new empires. It needs a new society. And no one has the right to rule out the possibility that the further course of developments in China may lead to an improvement of its domestic situation and, consequently, of its foreign policy.

At the same time it is necessary to reckon with reality on the international scene, as well as with the mad plans of chauvinistic politicians both in the West and the East. We



learn as much from contemporary history which cannot boast of being to complacement.

China is a great country and the Chinese are great people worthy of world-wide respect. It is obvious that the PRC should occupy a fitting place in the world and play an important role in international relations. But to achieve this it has to pursue a correct policy and not plunge into one venture after another and betray the ideas for the sake of which the PRC was formed. It should be hoped that the Chinese people, which is a pawn in the game that is being played in the Chunnanghai palace, will sooner or later become aware of this.

*1971*

## 11. GREATNESS OR BARBARITY

Legends live long. This, however, applies not only to folklore. Wrong or inaccurate narratives about events and personalities recounted by their contemporaries or later interpreters are believed for centuries. Quite often they are taken for the truth even when the reasons which had inspired the falsification of the truth, the unwarranted elevation, or, on the contrary, vilification of one or another historical personage, have long since disappeared. Invention turns into tradition. Even when re-checked facts contradict a legend it is not discarded; it becomes petrified. More often than not this happens to legends that idealise so-called "powerful personalities" which for a particular reason have become favourites with the bourgeoisie.

Thus, is it necessary, for instance, in our time which is distinguished by a scientific, strictly critical view of things, to laud and glorify famous conquerors of the past, including emperors, kings and khans? Is it necessary to extol their names, write laudatory novels about them and for their sake touch up the realities of their epoch? Is it also necessary to search for some sort of a hidden, inner substance of these people that raises them above all the others and turns them into higher beings who can do what they wish?

As we have already said the habit of regarding the high and mighty tyrants of the past as great personalities is a typical bourgeois trait. It is in the nature of a bourgeois to experience an insurmountable inclination to kowtow to



a despot who orders him around. Psychological masochism of this sort is also in the nature of the Philistine who regards the scourge as something elevated. But a thinking contemporary has had his fill of legends. In our age of nuclear physics, cybernetics and astronautics he needs iron facts in history, too, and is quite capable of digesting them.

Hence the heavy responsibility that rests on historians and writers in some countries, and not only in the West, who are still inclined to idealise the famous tyrants and conquerors of the past. They are not always on speaking terms with the truth, and are far from always unbiased. Where there is dirt they see a mysterious "profound" idea which, in fact, had never existed. Where there is avarice and vanity, baseness and deceit they see a spark of genius and foresight. What they see is not only their personal business. In many cases they deceive themselves. But in all cases they deceive the credulous reader.

Like other people I have read many books, biographies and novels of this kind and quite often was moved to sincere indignation. Why embellish history?

Baseless hero-worshipping can be justified neither by artistic demands nor "psychological" reasons. It causes great harm, particularly to the budding generations which seek genuine romance. In our day it has transcended the limits of ordinary literature. Legends are now placed at the service of discreditable policies. A case in point is the legend about the "progressive unifier" of Asia Genghis Khan.

The famous conqueror Temuchin, or Genghis died 745 years ago. Since then historians, politicians, writers and military specialists tried to fathom the enigma surrounding him. How did this illiterate semi-barbarian nomad, leader of the hordes of steppe horsemen who suddenly descended on the world, manage to conquer in a mere 16 years a large part of Asia, from Peking to the Caucasus, and how did his sons and commanders manage to vanquish half of Europe, from the Urals to the Elbe and the Adriatic?

Genghis Khan is a unique figure in history. Neither Alexander the Great, nor Ceasar, nor Napoleon can be put on

a par with him as regards the size of territory they had conquered. It has been estimated that one half of the population of the world at the time lived in the countries which he and his generals had vanquished. The Tatar-Mongol yoke in Rus which lasted 240 years was also a direct result of Genghis Khan's campaigns. To what did he owe his staggering, unexampled successes?

People argued about this for centuries. They could neither forget nor understand the catastrophe that overwhelmed the Medieval world. It was hit by a hurricane which originated in the heart of the desert. All sorts of explanations were given. Some attributed everything to Genghis Khan's singular genius: this mysterious Asian from a nomad tribe miraculously accomplished what no contemporary of his and those that came after him were ever capable of achieving. Others maintained that it was hunger which struck at the beginning of the 13th century that put hordes of Asians, like locusts, on the move and that Genghis Khan rose on the crest of that wave. Still others maintained that he owed his victories to sheer superiority in manpower. This proved to be incorrect. His entire army in the years of its decisive battles did not exceed 230,000 warriors and at the time of his death totalled only 130,000.

There were people who thought that Genghis Khan was designated to perform a mystic mission as the chosen son of his race which all of a sudden became aware of its might and decided to engage in a test of strength with its neighbours–the Chinese, Muslim and Christian peoples. Many thoughts and conjectures were expressed. But in spite of their differing opinions about Genghis Khan's amazing successes, historians agreed on one thing: he and his army were the very incarnation of evil. He built nothing; but only destroyed and killed.

There are numerous documents disclosing how Genghis Khan waged his wars. Even our contemporary with the heinous crimes of the fascists still fresh in his mind feels the blood freeze in his veins when he reads them. Genghis Khan built neither concentration camps nor prisons. He had another method. Wherever his troops encountered



resistance they razed everything to the ground. The inhabitants of whole cities were massacred and huge regions were put to the torch. An invasion by Genghis Khan, wrote the famous Arab historian ibn-al-Athir, who lived at the time, became "a terrible misfortune the likes of which were produced neither by day nor by night, and it embraced all beings".

All that remained after the departure of Genghis Khan's hordes were "pyramids of skulls and the slime of decaying bodies", wrote another of his contemporaries, the Persian historian Juzjani. The miasma of death and decay was so overpowering in such places that people were afraid to return to them, and they became a source of the plague.

On Genghis Khan's orders his soldiers spared no one. "They came and wreaked havoc, shot arrows and killed, tied up their loot and departed," recounted an eyewitness who survived the sacking of Bukhara in 1220. The capital of Khorezm, Gurganja, was turned into a swamp. When the inhabitants of Barmian refused to surrender, Genghis Khan ordered that everything alive in the town–people, animals an birds–should be put to death and all buildings razed to the ground. He also promulgated a law prohibiting his commanders to live in peace with rulers and peoples who were still unvanquished.

A century later another Eastern tyrant Tamerlane, who also became the hero of romantic legends, surpassed even Genghis Khan in brutality. He ordered his troops to build human towers in the cities he captured. Two thousand people were piled alive one on top of the other and covered with clay and bits of broken bricks. But Genghis Khan had neither time nor patience to indulge in such things. He waged lightning wars and was content with killing, but chiefly with looting. He carried away gold and silver, silk and other fabrics, draught animals, children, women and slaves. Engels wrote that Genghis Khan's hordes "devoured everything that came their way".

He imposed heavy contributions on towns which surrendered to him and subjugated their inhabitants. He and his associates personally took part in the looting receiving a lion's share of the spoils. When he captured the Chin

state in the north of China, he, as usual, ordered mass extermination of the population and also demanded that its ruler should personally pay him a contribution of a vast quantity of gold and silver, 500 boys, 500 girls, 3,000 horses and the ruler's daughter. His commanders took their share, too.

All this took place on a vast territory embracing China, Central Asia, Persia, Transcaucasia, Rus and later Central Europe. No other conqueror left such a terrible memory in the peoples' minds as Genghis Khan. And that is how history portrays him. For seven and a half centuries he was regarded as a mad, homicidal, military leader who thought only of looting and violence. Just recently we learned that in the capital of one of the world's biggest countries an ideological halo has been put around the name of Genghis Khan and that he has been made an historical hero.

That capital is Peking.

Back in 1962 the Chinese historical journal *Lishi Yenchiu* published an article entitled "Genghis Khan" by the historian Han Ju-lin,[1] which created a sensation among the uninitiated. We should like to quote a few extracts from the article for the benefit of those who want to know how political legends are created.

"In the past," Han Ju-lin wrote, "some historians had a negative opinion of Genghis Khan. They ... failed to perceive his progressive role in history. At the time anyone who managed to unite the different tribes and put an end to plunder and killings would have contributed to the historical process and earned the support and acclaim of the people. Genghis Khan fulfilled this historic mission....

"Of course, subjectively, like the leaders of backward tribal groups, he waged wars not for the sake of saving his people, but in order to satisfy his 'evil desires–avarice and craving for power'.... The establishment of control

[1] This article was reprinted in full in Russian translation in the book *Historical Science in China*, Moscow, 1971, pp. 280-89. Its author expressed the same views at a meeting of the Nanking Historical Society (*Kwangming jihpao*, June 8, 1962).



over the rich steppes belonging to other tribes strengthened Genghis Khan to such a degree that he could be likened to a tiger who had grown wings."

Disclosing his main thought Han Ju-lin writes: "Genghis Khan obliterated all state borders between the Pacific Ocean in the east and the Caspian Sea in the west. Historians say that during his lifetime he 'destroyed forty states', including states in the Western region. In order to strengthen their rule and heighten the exploitation of the population, the slaveowners or feudal lords in these states regarded them as closed regions and shut the eyes and muffled the ears of their people and isolated themselves from other states.... But when Genghis Khan, the 'supreme ruler', appeared, his chargers pierced the thick walls which locked in the peoples of these forty big and small states and enabled their peoples to see a wider world in which they could act, and familiarise themselves with a higher culture from which they could learn. Is there really any need to assess Genghis Khan negatively from the standpoint of the trends in historical development? The destruction of forty states could not have taken place without bloodshed and devastation."

Unbelievable! We quoted these extracts word for word. To destroy forty states means to play "a progressive role in history". To massacre whole towns means to help "peoples see a wider world". To plunder and enslave absolutely guiltless people means to pierce the "thick walls" dividing the peoples, so that they could "familiarise themselves with a higher culture". Genghis Khan did all this and, according to the Maoist historian, therein lies his greatness.

"The starry sky turned–all men were locked in strife. People did not go to bed–all plundered one another. The entire surface of the earth trembled–a universal war was going on. You could not lie down on a blanket–so great was the hostility of all people."

That is how an ancient chronicle describes Mongolia prior to Genghis Khan. One can realise what it meant to live in those parts at the time. Han Ju-lin quotes these words to vindicate his hero who united the warring tribes

under his iron rule and established his own order in their lands. This is true. But the main thing is that what under Genghis Khan ended in Mongolia, began during his lifetime and because of him across the vast expanse from the Pacific Ocean to the Caspian Sea. Now not only the Mongolian steppe "trembled" but the whole of Asia, and then came Europe's turn. One half of the world's population "did not go to bed". But that is irrelevant to the man who has been ordered to rehabilitate Genghis Khan. Someone at whatever the cost needs the "supreme ruler" and conqueror, the "tiger who had grown wings".

That's how a legend is created. Now let's see what purpose it is designed to serve.

Genghis Khan is among those people whose names have left an imprint on the Middle Ages; he is one of the cohort of maniacal tyrants who made whole countries tremble for so long. No one can possibly estimate what Attila, Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, Frederick I "Barbarossa", Pope Innocent III and later Caesar Borgia, Philip II and other "great men" cost the world. But did these people, if given a closer look, actually have a spark of true greatness in them?

In this respect the figure of Genghis Khan reveals a great deal, and not only about himself.

Who was this "unifier of Asia"? Whom did he represent? For whom had he waged his wars?

Was he a leader of the people? Did he stand at the head of a national movement which suddenly flared up against foreign oppressors? Or was he a leader of hungry nomads who attacked neighbouring countries in search of food for themselves and their families?

Nothing could be further from the truth. Everything was totally different and Orientalists have provided incontrovertible proof. The conqueror of "one half of the world" was neither a commoner nor a fighter for his people. To call him a rebel, a sort of an Asian Stepan Razin is something which even his present-day champions cannot do. It would be more correct to say that he was the direct opposite of that Russian peasant leader who lived four centuries later.



Genghis Khan belonged to the nomad aristocracy, a section which lived by plunder alone. He was the son of the leader of *altan uruk*, or the golden clan, and was the great grandson of Kabul Khan, famous for his raids into China. From the beginning to the end of his life Genghis Khan lived in these surroundings.

The nomadic Mongol feudal lords (*noyons*) were no less avaricious and power-loving and even more vicious than the settled feudal lords in other countries. They had no moral principles even in the purely formal meaning of the word in Europe of the Middle Ages. They had no principalities, no unassailable castles and no latifundia, but owed their power to their domination over pastures and possession of great herds of horses and flocks of sheep. But that gave them the same power over the weak and the deprived, as ownership of land gave the settled princes. The poor nomads became the shepherds, servants or warriors of the pasture-owners. The princes of the steppes did not know the luxury in which the European feudal lords lived; instead of priests they had shamans; they were totally illiterate, but their avarice was unsurpassed.

For centuries nothing changed in this nomad society. The sun scorched the steppes, herds roamed from place to place, bands of armed horsemen would suddenly appear from behind low hills and carry away women and children, and the nomads in their camps were afraid to "lie down on their blankets". No other life could even be imagined. The robber *noyons* left no one in peace. But at the beginning of the 13th century a leader emerged from their midst who subjugated the others and within a few years created a truly nomadic power. This man was Genghis Khan. In 1206 at a *khuriltai* (great meeting) of the leaders of aristocratic clans, the heads of "generations living in felt tents", he was proclaimed great khan. It is on record that already then Genghis Khan declared: "Heaven has ordained me to rule all peoples."

The course of events showed that since then he had no other thought in mind and never acted out of national con-

siderations. He despised the ordinary people of his country. At the time another tribal leader Jamuga roamed the steppes of Mongolia who, according to all indications, was truly close to the people. He was on friendly terms with the modest nomadic shepherds and not with the warlike herdsmen, and had an inclination for the new, so that the illiterate aristocracy of the steppes could have regarded him an apostate. The prominent Orientalist V. V. Bartold even calls him a "democrat" and speaks about a "democratic movement" which he headed. There is a record of Jamuga's description of Genghis Khan's men: "Curs reared on human flesh. He has tied them to an iron chain. These curs have copper foreheads, hewed teeth, awl-shaped tongues and iron hearts. Now that they have been let loose from their chains, saliva flows from their lips and they are happy." When these words were pronounced that part of Asia had neither a written language nor a literature. But they carry more meaning to the contemporary than whole volumes. How many times future generations repeated these words with bitterness in their hearts.

Jamuga tried to rally supporters in order to smash Genghis Khan, but was routed, betrayed to the enemy and executed. The tyrant's road to the throne of Asia and Europe was now open.

Genghis Khan, however, built his state not for the poverty-ridden nomads whom he sent to their death, but for himself, his kith and kin and his favourites. In fact, Mongolia under him was his property. Everything, including land, pastures, cattle and people belonged to the great khan. His retinue received large plots of land. His army was divided into units of 10,000, 1,000 and 100 men whose commanders were appointed by the khan himself. Almost all the loot appropriated during his campaigns was divided between himself and the commanders, while the rank-and-file warriors received mere crumbs. Genghis Khan had a personal guard of 10,000 steppe aristocrats, all of whom were blindly devoted to him. His word was the only law in the country. No other authority, even religious, existed there (the shamans played no independent role in politics, and lamaism reached Mongolia only three



centuries later). After Jamuga's execution Genghis Khan had no opponents in the country.

That explains why under Genghis Khan the life of the people became worse and not better. The feudal rent in the tyrannical nomadic state was a tremendous burden on them. The ordinary cattle-breeders and hunters were tied down to the land which passed into the hands of the nobility; they had to pay tribute both to their masters and to the great khan even during campaigns.

So there is absolutely no reason to talk about a national movement under Genghis Khan's banner. He was a typical feudal lord in the Asiatic sense of the word and not only by birth but by calling, heart and soul, and no European or Asian writer can prove the opposite. It is useless to look for something elevated and noble in his actions.

But perhaps Genghis Khan can at least be regarded as a prominent statesman who united, according to the Chinese historian Han Ju-lin, the peoples of Asia? This is the falsest of all the assertions that are made about him.

It is true that towards the end of his life Genghis Khan ruled over a territory totalling many thousands of square kilometres, almost the whole of continental Asia with the exception of India, Indochina and the northern lands. This was indeed an unheard-of accomplishment. But is it true that by his conquests he united the peoples of Asia and thus guided that continent onto the road of historical progress?

Let's glance at a map showing Asia at the beginning of the 13th century. Two huge states, China and Khorezm, lay to the south and west of Mongolia at the time. Both with an incomparably higher level of development than Genghis Khan's homeland.

At the time China's cultural development was the highest in the world. No European country could compare with it, and all of them were centuries behind it in production, the level of urban civilisation and spiritual life. The Chinese had already mastered the art of printing which was invented in Europe only two centuries later. Paper money, gunpowder, postal stations appeared in China

earlier than in Europe. Affluent Chinese cities seethed with activity. Crafts developed rapidly and professional corporations were in existence. Chinese merchants extensively traded with many countries and their ships performed long voyages. Canals were dug in the country, its natural resources were developed and metalware manufactured Chinese literature and art also occupied a leading place in the world, and Chinese philosophers, poets, artists and sculptors were widely known.

True, in the 13th century China was gripped by a profound social crisis resulting from the oppression of the feudal lords and their internecine wars. The country was divided into two hostile camps, the Chin state in the north and Sung in the south. Militarily China was weak and incapable of repulsing a determined aggressor, just as Rome was unable to counter the invasions of the German barbarians. Yet China was in the forefront of human progress, while Mongolia was thousands of years behind it in development.

Extending from the Hindu Kush to the Caucasus and from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf, Khorezm was less developed than China, but Mongolia lagged far behind it, too. Having inherited the lands of the ancient Persian Empire, Khorezm was at the crossroads of Asian-European trade. Its flourishing cities–Bukhara, Samarkand and Urgench–were centres of Muslim culture. It had schools and libraries and famous scholars, including Avicenna and al-Biruni. From Khorezm roads led to the vast Arab world.

There is no doubt that both China and Khorezm were advanced states in Asia at the time. Genghis Khan turned both of them to ruins. Further westward in Europe lay the third civilised state–Rus. Genghis Khan's heirs routed it too, and placed it under the Tatar yoke which lasted 240 years. Clouds of smoke bellowed over the seized "40 states". Can this be called the unification of Asia?

As a political or spiritual idea Asia meant nothing to Genghis Khan. He never had nor could have had any all-Asian, pan-Asian or at least anti-European ideas. He and his henchmen razed Asian cities in just the same way as European ones, and massacred Asians with exactly the



same brutality as Europeans. There is nothing in any of his statements to indicate his sympathy for the peoples of his continent or his awareness of their problems. For him Asia was only a vast pastureland for his cattle and the cattle of his vassals, an inexhaustible source of plunder and a place of never-ending carnage to glorify his name. He had no other motives.

It is likewise impossible to call him great because by piercing the walls between the conquered states he opened the way for merchants who carried on trade between China and Central Asia. What he destroyed exceeded by a thousand times what he "opened". Suffice it to recall the terrible harm his invasions brought to Central Asia which played a key role in the system of world trade. In North China his vandalism fell just short of genocide. Only the SS in the 20th century wrecked seats of culture with such total lack of mercy as did the cutthroats of Genghis Khan. The relative freedom of caravan routes in his smoke-enshrouded empire explains why the merchants whom he patronised became supporters of the Mongolian aristocracy of the steppes, but by no means testifies to Asia's economic burgeoning under his rule.

History has proved that Genghis Khan played an anti-progressive role in the development of Asia. His campaigns were directly responsible for the catastrophe that overtook the more civilised countries both in Asia and Eastern Europe. China, Khorezm, Rus, Tangut, the state of the Kara-Kitais and some other countries were thrown back hundreds of years in their development *just at the time when Western Europe was already approaching the great epoch of the Renaissance.*

Given serious consideration, the significance of this fact can hardly be overestimated. There is every reason to say that it was Genghis Khan and his generals, among them Batu, Ogotai and Subotai, who prevented Asia in our millennium from reaching Europe in level of development and, taking into account the giant manpower resources and natural wealth of the Asian continent, perhaps even surpassing it. If in that decisive epoch the nomad Mongols had not held up by sword and fire the development of

Asian culture by two or three hundred years, many Asian countries would have not become the helpless prey of European imperialism in the 18th and 19th centuries. No sterner sentence than this can be passed on Genghis Khan.

Neither did he build anything lasting for Mongolia itself. His empire collapsed a mere forty years after his death. A multitude of independent khanates and princedoms appeared where this semi-god had held undivided sway. As regards the Mongolian people, they gained nothing but only lost as a result of his wars. Two generations of Mongols were separated from their families and homes and found themselves in foreign lands, but their own country did not benefit from this. The normal development of the Mongol society was interrupted for a long time, and the nomads became even more used to living by robbery and violence. Four centuries after Genghis Khan's death the Mongols were enslaved by the Manchurian khans.

The historical result of Genghis Khan's conquests amounted to nothing. That is how later generations evaluate the life of all tyrants. They leave behind them graves, and smoke and legends and nothing more.

Some may say that not only the wars and other ventures of Genghis Khan in those remote and cruel times merit attention, and that his own personality is also of great interest.

This is true. Setting aside his incredible vandalism, he essentially acted in the same way as all or almost all other feudal lords acted at the time depending on their power and abilities. In one respect, however, he differed from them: he wore no theological mask. Yet he surpassed all of them. What was his secret? What sort of a person was he?

The answers to these questions are interesting indeed and not only for psychologists. Life repeatedly teaches us that outstanding personalities may play a great role in periods of political storms. It would be meaningless to deny this. Fortunately in this case a historian has adequate facts and not only legends at his disposal. Genghis Khan created such a tremendous impression on his contemporaries that they tried to find out and write down



as much about his personality as possible. Such records are to be found in the works of Asian and European writers.

Was there at least anything attractive or profound in his personality? The ability to invade other countries and wipe them off the face of the earth does not make a man great.

There are people who tend to worship men like Genghis Khan. Fully aware of the crimes committed by them they, nevertheless, believe in their greatness. They brush aside as immaterial or secondary, or even inevitable in the conditions of the given period all that prevents one from seeing them in that light. Such people are more impressed by the outward manifestations of greatness. And it is quite easy to imagine Genghis Khan in the enchanting aura of Medieval oriental romance.

...An illimitable steppe. A scorching sun and swarms of charging yellow-skinned horsemen armed with bows and arrows. No one can resist them. They flood the world. States disappear in their wake.... Among them, astride a winged horse, is the king of the steppes, the ruler of Asia, a huge man with the eyes of a cat.[1] No one knows his thoughts. Sowing terror, but omniscient, merciless, but inspired, he leads the peoples. Time bows to his will.... Night fires, a camp which seems to have neither beginning nor end and a silent steppe. He is alone in his tent. Tomorrow he will decide the fate of yet another country.

Such movie scripts about Genghis Khan aren't difficult to write with centuries separating his and our time. But it is difficult to give a faithful portrayal of him although not impossible owing to the facts that have reached us.

Undeniably this feudal lord of the steppes had great will-power, self-control and rare cunning, plus singular dynamism. Still we could say something else about him, and in the first place that he had nothing in common with the people of his country.

He was extraordinary greedy. The greater the wealth he amassed, the greater was his craving for more loot. At

[1] That is how contemporaries described Genghis Khan.

the same time he ordered the ordinary Mongols not to wash their dress and wear it until it rotted away.

He was illiterate. And though he had literate Uighurs in his service, he never learned to read or write. He despised the culture of other peoples and sent it up in smoke wherever he could.

At times he would drink and eat himself into a stupor. He had numerous wives and innumerable concubines. Women had a purely carnal attraction for him; he placed a much greater value upon horses. The loveliest of the maidens captured during campaigns were presented to him. He was always accompanied by an orchestra of 17 or 18 beautiful young women. Though he has been the subject of a vast number of legends not a single romantic story about him has reached us.

He was not brave. In his time commanders frequently went into battle with their men. Genghis Khan, according to witnesses, preferred to keep at a safe distance. On one occasion, according to records, he galloped away from the scene of the fighting, leaving his wife in the hands of the enemy.

He was in terror of death and hoped to live for ever. In 1222, five years before he died, he summoned a learned monk Ch'ang Ch'un from China. His first question to him was:

"Holy father, you've come from afar. What medicine that can make man immortal have you brought along for me?"

Only his extraordinary vanity exceeded his superstitiousness. Once he said that if the sovereigns who came after him would not observe his laws, people would once again "look for Genghis Khan and would not find him", and that then five hundred, a thousand, ten thousand years would pass and help would come from heaven to posterity only if they preserved his laws. Does not the language of Genghis Khan resemble some of the statements which are heard in the 20th century.

According to the Persian historian Juzjani, Genghis Khan, who died when he was 72, suffered from heavy fits of epilepsy in his old age. He would fall into lengthy



trances, and at such moments he expressed views which his closest associates gave the force of law.

Had he any convictions? Yes, he had. He expounded them in a conversation with his generals couching them in words that reflected his image as though in a mirror. Even if we knew nothing else about his character, these words alone would enable us to paint his portrait. Replying to the question: "Wherein lay man's supreme happiness?", Genghis Khan said (his words are recorded in ancient chronicles):

"Man's supreme happiness reposes in defeating his enemies, in driving them before him, depriving them of their possessions, in seeing faces which were dear to them stained with tears, in riding their horses and embracing their daughters and wives."

Perhaps, this is also ideology. If so, then bestiality is ideology too.

There are people who think that Genghis Khan's crimes and views should be attributed to the influence of his times and his environment. This, naturally, is true of all people. But isn't it the ability to look beyond the borders of their country and lead it and think beyond the confines of their day and age that distinguishes truly great people? And can glorification of the coarsest, bestial instincts be at any time a sign of a man's greatness?

Finally, was Genghis Khan a military genius? Some will find this question particularly interesting in view of his astounding victories.

Undisputably he had exceptional military talent and was much more gifted than his Asian and European adversaries. It was not all that simple to build up the world's most powerful army out of uncivilised nomads and in a mere 16 years to conquer half the world. But it would be incorrect to attribute the extraordinary victories of the Mongols exclusively to Genghis Khan. There were two circumstances which helped him and without which he would have achieved nothing.

First, it has to be taken into account that the three major states, victory over which made the Mongols mas-



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ters of two continents, were in a condition of internal disintegration at the time. In the beginning of the 13th century political chaos reigned in China in spite of its high culture. The country was split into two hostile parts, its economy declined and the state was exhausted by disputes and corruption of the ruling feudal lords. Though the Chinese generals had age-old experience to draw upon, their army was incapable of fighting a major war and holding its own against a brave enemy. A huge country, China had a very weak backbone.

Khorezm, on the opposite side of Mongolia, was also incapable of resistance. Shah Mohammed and his satraps established such a rapacious regime that the exhausted state simply collapsed under the impact of the first powerful blow opening the road further to the south and east to Genghis Khan. Rus, the third main opponent of the Tatar-Mongol hordes, was also weak. It was fragmented into numerous independent principalities. Each prince looked only after his own interests and would have been glad if the others perished. While Genghis Khan's troops were a monolithic fighting force, Rus did not have a united army. He pounced on his enemies when they were experiencing the greatest difficulties. But that was not all.

Engels, a major authority on military matters, pointed out that there was a close link between the art of warfare and the economy. Genghis Khan's victories strikingly confirm this thought for he owed them above all to Medieval Mongolia's nomadic economy.

In those times the outcome of a battle depended chiefly on only one arm of the troops, the cavalry, which in effect decided everything. It delivered the main blow, breached the weak links in the enemy's dispositions, performed rapid outflanking movements, pursued the retreating enemy, and wore down those who stopped in their flight. In other words, it played the same role on the battlefield as the one played by tanks in our day. Most of the battles were won by the side whose cavalry was more powerful and displayed greater mobility. The Mongols had the best cavalry in the world in the first half of the 13th century,



and the reason for this was their mode of production based on a nomadic economy.

From childhood the Mongol nomad was inseparable from his horse. It was his main helper in the struggle for survival. He was a born horseman and with time learned to ride with extraordinary skill. He could make his horse gallop at breakneck speed, he knew how to hide himself and his horse, how to sleep on horseback, how to live on mare's milk (*koumiss*) doing without any other food, and how to cover great distances across plains and deserts, mountains and regions, intersected by rivers, on his mount.

Marco Polo, who was in the employ of Genghis Khan's grandson Kublai Khan for a considerable period, wrote about the nomads: "Their horses are so well broken into quick changes of movement, that upon the signal given they instantly turn in every direction." He also made the following observation: "When the service is distant, they carry but little with them, and that, chiefly, what is requisite for their encampment, and utensils for cooking. They subsist for the most part upon milk. . . . They are provided with small tents made of felt, under which they shelter themselves against rain."[1] It was difficult to find such born horsemen in other countries, and Genghis Khan took this into account when he built up his army and evolved his tactics.

Light cavalry made up twothirds of his troops. Each horseman had one or two spare horses in the train. During rapid marches he changed horses two or three times a day. He had two bows, arrows, a lance, a sword, a hatchet and an iron cudgel, and many had whips. None wore heavy armour. All were trained from childhood to disregard the weather, go half-hungry and were skilled bowmen. Ten such horsemen made up a platoon, ten platoons–a company, ten companies–a *guran* of a thousand men, ten *gurans*–a *tuman* or a division, and two or three *tumans*–a horde or a corps. All hordes were under the command of Genghis Khan.

---

[1] *The Travels of Marco Polo*, London, 1818, p. 214.

Such a mobile army easily pierced the ranks of the armour-clad troops of the enemy, just as modern tanks slice through the ranks of inadequately protected infantry. The army of the Chin state, which vastly surpassed Genghis Khan's cavalry in manpower, sustained a shattering defeat. And when his generals led their troops into Western Europe there was nothing that the resplendent but clumsy mounted knights and the plebeian infantry could do with the Mongol cavalry. The Asian nomads had no trouble coping with European princes and barons.

That explains the secret of Genghis Khan's military successes. It is written down in Chinese documents of the time, evidently in order to show that the Chinese were not responsible for their defeat, that he "led his troops like a god", and many European authors later expressed similar views. They failed to perceive the main thing, namely, that Genghis Khan's victories should be attributed not so much to him as to the nature of the nomadic Mongol troops. Assertions about his "godsent" military genius is simply a part of the legend about him.

Why, and seemingly for no apparent reason, have the Maoists picked up this legend in the 1960s?

Obviously they did this deliberately. Historians in the Maoist state do not speak up whenever they want and do not say what they want to say. When Han Ju-lin published his sensational article in *Lushi Yenchiu* he was certainly acting on instructions from above.

The following facts meet the eye. The eulogisation of Genghis Khan in China began on the crest of a sweeping wave of great-power nationalism. Genghis Khan was a Mongol and China's sworn enemy. Now he is portrayed as China's national hero or something of that sort. According to Han Ju-lin the conquest of China by Genghis Khan and his heirs was a progressive step because it led to the establishment of a great united empire in Asia. Dwelling on the Mongol conquest of the individual states that made up China at the time, Hun Ju-lin wrote:

"Genghis Khan destroyed or began to destroy these kingdoms which had entered a stage of collapse, removed



the borders between nationalities, destroyed the walls which divided the Han (Chinese–*E.H.*) nation, and restored our great multinaional state to what it was under the Han and Tang dynasties. . . . The war between the Mongols and the Chin state lasted longer than any other, and brought the most terrible suffering. But would it be just to hold Genghis Khan alone responsible for the fact that all living things disappeared north of the Huang Ho (a river separating north and south China–*E.H.*) and that white bones were strewn in disorder like hemp?"

The year the article was published in *Lishi Yenchiu*, Han Ju-lin addressing the Historical Society in Nanking said outright: "The dynasty founded by Genghis Khan played a progressive role in China's history."

In other words, it is not important that living beings disappeared from Chinese lands which were seized by Genghis Khan. The important thing is that he united these lands. It is not important that white bones were strewn everywhere in disorder. The important thing is that a Heavenly Kingdom was built on them. It is not important that Genghis Khan was a Mongol and not a Chinese. The important thing is that having conquered China he should be considered a Chinese.[1] Hence Genghis Khan's world empire might be regarded as China's legitimate heritage.

That is the crux of the matter and the key to the mystery surrounding the "rehabilitation" of Genghis Khan. Had there been no Genghis Khan, it would have been necessary to invent him. Contemporary Maoist nationalism which has embarked on a *great-Han foreign policy* needs the legend about Genghis Khan.

Han Ju-lin was not the only one to make such statements. More and more people in the PRC began to revise its history with increasing disregard for facts. Still earlier

[1] This is not an exaggeration. Long before the formation of the PRC, when the Maoist leadership had its headquarters in Yenan, the portraits of Mao Tse-tung and Genghis Khan hung side by side on the wall of the leader's office. A visitor who asked about the portrait that hung next to Mao Tse-tung was told: "It is a portrait of a Chinese emperor who also ruled Russia."

similar views were expressed by the historians Yu Yuan-an and Chou Ku-cheng. Later Nanking University issued a statement saying that Kublai Khan, Genghis Khan's grandson who became emperor in Peking, "made an outstanding contribution to the development of our united and multinational state". Kublai Khan who routed and plundered China also seized Burma, Annam, Cambodia and Korea, and even tried to invade Japan. That, evidently, explains why the Maoists consider that he also played a "positive role in history". The official "Map of China During the Period of Its Supreme Might", which was published in those years in the PRC, included all the countries that had been invaded by Genghis Khan and his successors. Hence almost all the peoples of Asia and many in Europe are regarded as China's former vassals.

At the same time the Chinese journal *Sinkinagshe* carried an article which said in part: "It would be wrong to regard territorial expansion as aggression and call the weak and dying nationalities the objects of aggression and sympathise with them. The actions of a powerful nation or state designed to enlarge its territory are in keeping with the laws of social development of its time."

Had Genghis Khan been alive today he would have definitely supported this point of view. We should merely like to note that in our days the same thoughts were voiced by another man–Adolf Hitler. The Maoist journal repeated word for word what had been said by the authors of the "lebensraum" and "master race" theories.

When back in 1963 a politician from the ruling Liberal Democratic Party of Japan Matsemura arrived in Peking and began negotiations with high-ranking Maoist functionaries, he was told: "The East still remains the East. Asians should change world history." A clearer hint can hardly be imagined.

Today the Maoists are chiefly concerned with establishing China's hegemony in Asia, and this is where the Asian tyrant of the 13th century comes in handy.

Romantic legends enchant our contemporary no less than his predecessors, but he has no taste for political legends.



Historians know how "great kingdoms" of the past were created, how much blood, cruelty, treachery and falsity were needed to bring them into being. Neither is it a secret what sort of people the majority of the creators of such kingdoms were: power-hungry unprincipled tyrants with callous, mean hearts, without ideas, but obsessed with megalomania, and devoid of human dignity.

How many unctuous and treacly words were written by feudal and bourgeois authors to vindicate these people, to sing their praise and attribute to them the greatness, sagacity and depth of thought which they never possessed. How often such legends were used to justify new ventures. It was believed that great conquerors and tyrants turned the wheels of historical progress. But in almost all cases history proves the opposite.

What was so great about Genghis Khan? The sea of blood which he shed? But that is not a gauge of greatness. Apart from breeding grief and fright this blood did not fertilise an inch of Asian soil. "Iron will" and utter ruthlessness for the peoples, including his own, and the creation of a giant state at their expense? A state which promptly disintegrated into dozens of fragments which were also covered with blood, but which, too, gave the Asians neither order, nor culture, nor peace. The invention of a new military art, the art of lightning cavalry strikes? This art which was based on attacks by semi-barbarian herdsmen was shortly surpassed by another more sophisticated art of warfare based on the use of gunpowder, thus heightening the role of infantry and prompting the invention of artillery.

Nothing truly great has remained of this man who kept the world trembling in fear for decades. Just one book written by a great scientist, one work of a great author, one creation of a painter of genuis leave a deeper imprint on the history of world culture than all the conquests of Genghis Khan. Bourgeois philosophers may, of course, say that one should look for greatness even in barbarity. It's no use arguing about this. To each his own. We, on our part, believe that one is incompatible with the other.



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Historians ought to be honest. Those who aspire to hegemony in Asia, if not in the whole world, are now trying to rewrite history. This happened time and again in the past, and, evidently, so long as there are forces of imperialism and chauvinism in the world, it will continue to happen. But truth will out.

*1972*

## 12. AGAINST LIES IN WORLD POLITICS

I listen in to Peking Radio broadcasts about the USSR, which are packed with stories about its "aggressive intentions" towards China, the "pre-emptive blow" being prepared in Moscow and other falsehoods. It has been estimated that in 1973 alone two central Peking newspapers and the *Hungchi* journal, the mouthpiece of the Maoist Central Committee, carried more than 900 items vilifying the USSR or almost twice as many as in the preceding year. How many more articles of this kind were published in the following years.

I can't help wondering whether lies should be condoned in politics.

In bourgeois society, just as prior to it, the answer has never been in doubt. It was generally believed that a political lie was not only natural and permissible, but even vitally necessary, for without it, according to an unwritten law, politics would not be what they are. The more smoothly a politician lied the more weight he carried in the upper strata of society and the faster he carved out his career. This was a universally recognised fact which no one was ashamed to mention.

Pearsall Smith in his book *Sir Henry Wotton* quotes this British diplomat as saying that "an ambassador is an honest man sent to lie abroad for the good of his country". Talley-

rand asserted that the purpose of a diplomat's tongue was to conceal his thoughts. Machiavelli wrote: "We see from what has taken place in our own days that Princes who have set little store by their word, but have known how to overreach men by their cunning, have accomplished great things and in the end got the better of those who trusted to honest dealing," and added that he who would achieve the great must learn the art of deception.

This went on for centuries. Diplomats lied at all times. Frederick II of Prussia who described diplomats as "the least reputable of all rogues", was pretty good at foul play himself. Napoleon, without hiding his admiration mixed with contempt, called Metternich a diplomat of "near genius–he is so good at lying". "No one would believe how much charlatanism there is in diplomacy," wrote Bismarck who was an adept in this sort of thing.

At one time or another, under the most diverse circumstances, all imperialist statesmen lied, some crudely, others brilliantly.

Of course, they lied not merely for the sake of lying, or for love of lying, although sometimes this happened. Bourgeois politicians could not do without deception. And the great role that deception plays in imperialist politics in our epoch is borne out if only by the fact that both the First and Second World Wars started with direct lies.

When, in the summer of 1914, the relations between Austria-Hungary and Serbia deteriorated to such an extent that the threat of war loomed heavily over Europe, Austrian Foreign Minister Count Leopold von Berchtold went to his 84-year-old Emperor Franz Josef and placed the text of a note declaring war on Serbia on his desk for signature. In it he accused the Serbians of attacking Austrian border guards.

That was a lie. Nothing of the sort happened. The Austrian note was sent to Belgrade on the following day but it said nothing about the alleged attack on the border guards. Thus Berchtold achieved his purpose. The infuriated Franz Josef affixed his signature and war was proclaimed on Serbia.



Things followed a similar course in Berlin. On July 29, 1914 Kaiser's government accused France of intending to violate Belgium's neutrality. This, too, was a lie. It was the German army that was ordered to invade Belgium six days later. On the following day the text of a note proclaiming war on France was drawn up in Berlin. This time the French were accused of instigating border incidents and bombing German territory from the air. Later the Germans admitted that they had fabricated all those accusations. The war which carried away 10 million lives began the following day. Once again fabrications, for the true reasons which led to war lay in the struggle of the imperialist powers for the redivision of the world and were rooted in the depths of the capitalist economy. At the decisive moment, however, these lies acted like a detonator, though the game which the deceivers had started almost immediately turned against them.

Twenty-five years later the future of humanity again hung in the balance. And all that happened during the last hours before the Second World War is also recorded in history.

On September 1, 1939 Hitler delivered an hysterical speech in the Reichstag. Spluttering with anger, almost frothing at the mouth, he declared that Germany's patience had worn thin: at night the Poles attacked and wrecked a German radio station in the border town of Gleiwitz. Poland had flung Germany a challenge, he screamed, knowing very well that every word of his was a lie.

It was not the Poles but the Germans who attacked their own radio station at Gleiwitz. A group of concentration camp inmates who could speak Polish and were dressed in Polish uniforms were brought to the radio station. A few shots were fired in front of the microphone and the prisoners were ordered to shout threats against Germany in Polish. After that they were shot.

Code-named Himmler, the operation was stage-managed from Berlin by Gestapo chief Heinrich Müller and carried out under the command of Major Alfred Naujocks of the SS. When Hitler was speaking in the Reichstag, the Wehrmacht was already invading Poland. The Second World



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

War began at daybreak and could no longer be averted. Berlin's pretext served its purpose.

Later it became known that several weeks after the beginning of the war one of the chief participants in the provocation at Gleiwitz and chief of the nazi fifth column in Upper Silesia Otto Uhlitz was made ministerial adviser and awarded the gold badge of the Nazi party. As regards the immediate commander of the Gleiwitz operation, the SS man Naujocks, he is still alive according to a recent report. He lives in Hamburg and is one of the leaders of the revanchist association of fellow countrymen of Silesia. He was never brought to trial.

Initially Hitler's Anschluss of Austria, which took place prior to the war in 1938, was to have been carried out with the help of a provocation. The original plan envisaged an attack on the German mission in Vienna, and, if the need arose, even the assassination of the German ambassador. All this proved unnecessary, however, for the simple reason that at the decisive moment Hitler managed to seize Austria with his bare hands and without any complications with the Western powers.

These are hard facts backed up by authentic documents. In our century 60 million people died in tragedies which began with an ordinary, downright lie.

This should not be forgotten. Political falsifiers are still playing their role on the political scene. The idea that in our day deception in world politics can no longer lead to ominous consequences is unthinkable. The imperialist "hawks" have never scrapped this weapon.

We could list other cases when bloody wars were started on false pretenses. Here is an example from the last century. How did the Franco-Prussian war break out in 1870, a war which ended in the rout of France and the triumph of German militarism? The story behind it is reminiscent of a plot of a cheap detective thriller.

Already on the eve of the war it became clear that the Ems telegram from King Wilhelm I of Prussia, the grandfather of Wilhelm II, to his minister Bismarck, would serve as a pretext to start it. This telegram threw Napoleon III into a rage and overturned all efforts to settle the conflict



between the two countries peacefully. Bismarck recounted what had actually happened only 25 years later, when he had already retired and sought to assert his glory among the German militarists.

In those days a dispute broke out between France and Prussia over the candidature for the vacant Spanish throne. Intending to provoke France, Bismarck upheld the candidature of a German prince and thus immediately frightened France which had a common border with Spain. But the German prince declined the proposal. And when the French ambassador in Prussia Count Vincente Benedetti on July 13, 1870 met with King Wilhelm in the small town of Ems, the latter in a conciliatory tone declared that he was satisfied with the solution of the conflict. The king, who intended to continue the negotiations in Berlin, turned down the ambassador's request to receive him again in Ems. On the same day a telegram to this effect was sent to Bismarck in Berlin.

The message reached Bismarck while he was having lunch with the Prussian War Minister Albrecht Roon and Chief of the General Staff Helmuth von Moltke. Upon reading it, Bismarck asked the generals whether they were sure of Germany's victory in the event of war with France. The two men said yes. Bismarck asked them to continue their lunch, walked into an adjoining room and there "edited" Wilhelm's telegram. Its new version implied that the Prussian king showed the door to the French ambassador. "This will be a red rag to the Gallic bull," Bismarck told Roon and Moltke and read them the text. The generals were hugely pleased.

On the following day the doctored Ems telegram was published in the press. Five days later indignant France declared war on Prussia. Another seven weeks passed and the army of Napoleon III, which was smashed at Sedan, surrendered and the Prussians began to advance on Paris. Two months later Bismarck became Chancellor of a new German Reich. The elevation of a militaristic Germany was initiated at a critical moment by means of a forgery for which any ordinary man would have been sentenced to a long prison term.

German militarists have always lied at every opportunity, but were not very good at covering up the traces of their activity. According to them politics could not be conducted in any other manner and their present-day heirs, the revanchists, think the same. But not only Bismarck, Wilhelm II and Hitler were adept in this sort of thing. British, American and Japanese militarists were just as proficient at the game. Thus, all the colonial wars which these powers have waged began with a lie and ended with one. Here are just two examples.

In 1898, the US, in its quest for colonial possessions in the Caribbean and the Pacific, used a false pretext to go to war against Spain. The US Government said that its sole desire was to help the peoples of Cuba and the Philippines to get rid of their Spanish oppressors. On the eve of the war the American press mounted a noisy campaign in favour of US interference into Cuban affairs.

The influential newspaper magnate William Randolph Hearst sent the painter Frederic Remington to Cuba to make drawings of Spanish atrocities on the island. Upon arriving in Havana, Remington, as it later emerged, sent Hearst the following cable:

"Everything is quiet. There is no trouble here. There will be no war. I wish to return."

Hearst replied: "Please remain. You furnish the pictures and I'll furnish the war."

Hearst was right. On February 15, 1898 there was an explosion on the US battleship *Maine* which dropped anchor in Havana on a "friendly visit". The vessel sank and 266 of the crew died. The US indignantly blamed the Spaniards. It continued to heighten tension and several weeks later opened hostilities in the course of which the Spanish fleet was destroyed. According to the terms of the peace treaty Spanish possessions in the Caribbean and the Pacific came under US control.

Thirteen years later when the *Maine* was salvaged it was discovered that the explosion took place due to "internal causes". The investigation was not brought to completion, but even in the US itself the more unbiased observers agreed that the explosion was engineered by the Americans themselves.



Another example is to be found in the chronicles of recent years. Do all of us remember the beginning of US air strikes on North Vietnam in August 1964 and know exactly what the incident in the Gulf of Tonkin which preceded them was all about?

In July 1964 when the fate of the Saigon regime was hanging in the balance and mass student and Buddhist demonstrations in South Vietnam increased in frequency and scale, a US naval squadron suddenly appeared off the coast of North Vietnam in the Gulf of Tonkin. The reason, according to Washington, was an ordinary patrol mission. On August 1 these vessels violated North Vietnam territorial waters.

The US Government declared that North Vietnam torpedo-launches fired at the *Maddock* which was in neutral waters at the time. Actually nothing of the sort happened. It was merely a repetition of the trick with the *Maine*. A few days later President Johnson requested Congress to grant him extensive powers to wage the war in Southeast Asia and ordered the air strikes against North Vietnam which for so many years prevented a peaceful settlement in that part of the world. The Tonkin incident is no longer mentioned in the US. But historians have put on record that the point of departure of one of the most serious international conflicts of the latter half of the 20th century was a deliberate lie by the aggressor.

Our descendants will undoubtedly want to know why so many people in the past placed such blind faith in the lies with which the imperialists and the fascists smothered them?

How did it come to pass that people who for years and even decades on end were deluged with malicious lies and the most incredible fabrications took them at their face value without bothering to ascertain whether they were being told the truth or not?

This is not an easy question. The problem of drugging the consciousness of millions of people in a class-divided

society needs to be thoroughly studied. Of course, the reason lies not only in the strength of the imperialist propaganda apparatus or in the effect of a political shock, or in the special impact of a political lie on the philistine. Historians, politicians, sociologists and psychologists will supply their own answers.

One way or another, it is a fact that in the past and in our day, too, wars and extremely dangerous international conflicts originated from gross deceptions. The world has witnessed many such cases and they simply cannot be ignored.

This is what history teaches us. Today, owing to detente, the international scene has a different appearance than it had for many years running. People are weary of the cold war, and even the "hawks" in the imperialist camp no longer directly advocate fresh conflicts. It is impossible to produce honest and reasonable arguments against peaceful coexistence for the simple reason that they do not exist.

Nevertheless it is still possible to poison international relations with dishonest means and to hamper the further development of detente with the help of insidious calumny and fabrications. That is why falsehoods are still used by the opponents of peaceful coexistence and above all by anti-Soviet and anti-communist forces. Moreover facts show that this no longer applies solely to the imperialist "hawks".

There is no escaping the fact that Peking, too, systematically resorts to deception in its foreign policy. Day after day it spreads the fantastic "news" about the Soviet Union's "designs" towards the PRC. It is clear to thinking and more or less informed people that all this is a crude and stupid lie. But its Maoist authors are not deterred just as nothing seems to deter Western specialists in the same field. Both believe that all means, even the most foul, are perfectly suitable for their anti-Soviet campaigns and their backstage struggle against international detente.

For thousands of years lies were part and parcel of world politics. Many believed that that's how it would be



for ever, and today, too, many people think so. But are they right?

Are we entitled to think that deception is an essential element in contemporary international relations too? Has nothing changed since the days of the undivided sway of the feudal lords, and the bourgeoisie and statesmen in order to achieve their aims in international politics have to resort to lies, cunning and treachery?

Today people throughout the world, including the capitalist countries, speak about the need for security and peaceful coexistence. Those who really support this policy should seriously ponder the responsibility it entails.

Can any country or region feel absolutely secure if one or another government intends to employ deception? Can there be any talk of lasting peaceful coexistence, if one or another country secretly continues to base its foreign policy on the same sort of deception as was practised by Bismarck, Berchtold and Hitler, or the "hawks" in the Pentagon? One does not have to be a diplomat, a professor, or a general to answer these questions. Yet there are politicians today who would have liked to return to the past.

It is said that people have found it necessary to lie and cheat ever since they have learned to speak. Probably this is true. In the primitive and, even more so, in a class society deception was more often than not an essential method of fighting for survival. People lied in order to escape violence, to obtain bread for themselves and their families, to make a career, to overtake a rival and to gratify their inborn passions. In a society built on brute force, injustice and exploitation it was almost impossible not to lie in private life. Oppressors, tyrants and conquerors lied to further their class interests, and each time with dire consequences for whole countries. But in the 20th century a political lie has become too great a hazard to human civilisation.

Peaceful coexistence imperatively demands that all its supporters display integrity in their foreign policy. Disputes are unavoidable, but deception is impermissible. It

should be obvious that there is no other way of shifting international relations to peaceful rails.

Diplomacy will never disappear. The international class struggle continues, and there is no avoiding the fact that it comprises the main content of contemporary world politics. But it is high time that an end is put to criminal practices in international relations.

*1973*

## 13. THE TRUE FACE OF MAO TSE-TUNG

People still talk about China. It is in the centre of attention of world public opinion and it can hardly be expected that it will cease to be in the foreseeable future. Many people cannot comprehend how the events that occurred in the country actually came to pass. What has happened to the Chinese communists? And who, after all, is Mao Tse-tung.

One can either believe or disbelieve newspaper reports, the views of different authors or statements by political parties. But some things, namely, eyewitness accounts, cannot be easily ignored.

One such account has been published in Moscow. In my opinion it is a very important document. There is more drama in it than in any novel, and yet it was compiled by a person who saw everything with his own eyes.

We are talking about the diary of P. Vladimirov, Comintern's liaison officer and a TASS war correspondent who was sent to Mao Tse-tung's headquarters in Yenan in May 1942. For three and a half years he recorded all his thoughts and all that he saw and heard there. Since he saw Mao Tse-tung almost daily and lived next to him he did not have to hunt for information. Hardly any other person outside China has had such an opportunity to learn so much about Mao Tse-tung, his activity, views and character as Vladimirov who died in 1953.

A very clever man in every respect, Vladimirov was a most careful observer and took note not only of what stood out in bold relief but also of what was hidden from view. As we read his book we can easily follow what happened during the years when Mao Tse-tung, while still on the threshold of power, was already preparing to cross it. Those were the years when he had begun to hatch his insane plans. Three decades ago Vladimirov witnessed the beginning of what is taking place at present. His notes are valuable precisely because they are directly connected with our time.

"I must have no mercy for myself," he wrote on January 8, 1943, eight months following his arrival in Yenan. "I must write the truth. I must not lie to myself and search for compromises. Whether my dispatches are published or not, or whatever Moscow thinks about my reports, is something which I must not worry about. It is my duty to write the truth. I'm in debt to the thousands of people who are dying in the fight against fascism."

That's what Vladimirov wrote, and reading his diary one comes to appreciate what it all meant to him.

He himself was astounded by what he saw in Yenan. For instance, he heard the leader of the Maoists say literally the following: "According to Marxism it is above all essential for life and struggle that something should be put in here (Mao pointed to his open mouth) and that something should come out from here (he pointed to the exact spot)."

That's how Mao understands Marxism. For him it is the ideology of the digestive process. But this is just a minor detail. Here is the portrait of the "great helmsman" which Vladimirov had sketched already in May 1944 after spending two years in Yenan.

"He values only that person whom he needs at the moment. All that is useless to him is either immaterial or harmful.... Everything outside his sphere of interest is meaningless. Including the revolution.... Power embodies everything. The roads leading to supreme power are the only just roads.... Everything except power is mere dust.... Power is the only true meaning of life, it is the



sole justification of everything, it is a holiday, it is all–all.... The Party and the people are mere fiction (something abstract) which serve his aims.... He cripples Marxism whenever the philosophy of this teaching clashes with his personal views.... Principles link millions of people; he speaks in the name of principles and at the same time feels himself free of these very principles."

It was not easy for Vladimirov, who was a staunch Communist, to come to such conclusions. But he could not shut his eyes and lie to himself. Some time before he made the following observation about Mao Tse-tung: "Our meetings over a period of almost 14 months give me a rather good idea of him. His learning is superficial. There is nothing behind it." On another day he wrote: "How difficult it is to deal with people who are infatuated with their own sagacity. How they hide their cruelty behind their affability, graceful gestures and friendly chatter."

But what about the Party's ideas, about the principles whose observance is obligatory to all members? Vladimirov arrived at the following conclusion: "The principle of democratic centralism in the CPC is supplanted by suppression of any disagreement with 'Chairman Mao' and turns into the same sort of slavery by conviction which Marx wrote about in his time."

Principles are falsified all the time. "What I have learned during my contacts with Mao," Vladimirov wrote, "convinces me that he is truthful only when it suits his interests. He has no moral norms. If there is the strength or a chance to achieve something (even by the foulest of methods), then go ahead and do it. The necessary arguments will be found later."

Such are Mao Tse-tung's "convictions". All this, however, is politics. What about his private life? Can he be regarded an upright revolutionary in this respect at least? There is no avoiding this question too. And once again let the eyewitness testify.

From Vladimirov's entries made on January 17, 1943: "Mao Tse-tung and his entourage indulge in revelry: music, girls, plenty of drink and lovemaking.... Patched

clothes, 'frugal' food, a show of modesty, pledges of friendship, concern for the people's welfare–all are lies. . . ."

May 20, 1943: ". . .An assumed air of significance.

"At the same time he loves to eat and drink, dance and have a good time with girls. But that doesn't prevent him from preaching the rigid revolutionary asceticism for all others. He goes to great pains to create the impression that he is a wise ruler in the traditionally Chinese style."

November 15, 1944: "Mao is lazy. . . . He has a weakness for good food and eats a lot. The finest fruits and nuts are specially delivered to him."

All this took place when a large part of the country was in Japanese hands and the ordinary Chinese in the liberated area were on a starvation diet and stinted themselves in everything. Seeing all this, Vladimirov was barely able to control his anger. Mao Tse-tung himself was well aware of the plight of his compatriots. But he believed that he stood above the people and, consequently, could live as he wanted. Although in Yenan he did not live in a palace like he does today, but in board-lined caves, his private life already at that time resembled the mode of life of Chinese mandarins and emperors.

Another important question is who makes up his entourage? Who helps him in his work? Many of those who were close to him in Yenan are alive today. Vladimirov knew all of them and described them in his diary. One of them was Kang Sheng, chief of the "great helmsman's" punitive machinery. He was an adventurer who never stopped short of any crime, however heinous, and who subjected his victims to the most horrible torture. People secretly called him "autumn minister", which in ancient Chinese literature meant a "minister who sowed death among the people". Subsequently Kang Sheng managed to rise to great power in the country.

"It is interesting to note that it is the stunted, mediocre, perverted or the handicapped who prefer to serve in punitive organs," wrote Vladimirov about Kang Sheng's apparatus. "Their readiness to commit acts of violence and executions, to perjure themselves and inform against other people ensures them if not a swift promotion then at least



a comfortable existence." Elsewhere in his diary the author added: "Poisoning is a favourite method of settling accounts employed by Mao's associates."

Vladimirov mentioned other former advisers of Mao Tse-tung who are now important figures in Peking. The political and moral profile of some of these people is quite interesting. How petty and repugnant does the Mao group look today when scrutinised at close range.

But it would be a gross error to identify this group even in the smallest imaginable degree with the old, revolutionary Communist Party of China. Those, who built up this party and fought in its ranks in the decisive years of its underground activity and then when it came to power, were honest people and real heroes. Thousands of rank-and-file Chinese communists unhesitatingly gave their lives for the people's cause. They were real internationalists and true friends of the Soviet Union. They are the ones whom the Mao group is now putting out of the way, having started this campaign back in Yenan and even earlier.

Vladimirov pointed out the contradictions between the internationalist and the nationalist, Maoist wing of the CPC. He described how Mao Tse-tung and Kang Sheng methodically hounded Wang Ming, one of the real founders of the CPC and a friend of the Soviet Union. Attempts were made to poison him with toxic drugs. That was how the feudal lords acted during the reign of the Borgias.

The progressive Chinese intelligentsia was also constantly baited. "He (Mao Tse-tung–*E.H.*) destroys the intelligentsia both physically and morally, replacing it with his dogmatists and dogmatism," wrote Vladimirov on March 14, 1944. "This policy is directed against representatives of the intelligentsia who in principle have taken the side of the revolution. Instead of effectively co-operating with the intelligentsia Mao Tse-tung in fact cultivates an attitude of suspicion and abuse towards it."

We know that the same course only on a much greater scale was pursued some 20 years later, during the so-called cultural revolution. So far no count has been made of

the number of upright Chinese communists who became its victims. The terror in Yenan was only a rehearsal.

Vladimirov discloses other things in his notes. It would be a mistake to think that the Mao group's anti-Sovietism arose in the 1960s when the Maoists openly broke away from the world communist movement and began their attacks on the USSR. It was their inherent feature from the very beginning, even in Yenan and earlier. Vladimirov became quite certain of this.

"In the CPC," he wrote, "the national becomes the main ideological point of the programme, while the international is merely a verbal screen. This is felt at every step. Under no circumstances does Mao Tse-tung regard the USSR as an ideological ally and a friend; he looks upon it as a fellow-traveller which should be 'milked' as much as possible. Nothing is more important for their nationalistic aims."

Moreover Vladimirov established that from the outset of the Second World War Mao Tse-tung believed that the USSR was doomed and drew corresponding conclusions. "The CPC leadership is unconcerned with the main struggle of the working people of all countries–the struggle against fascism," Vladimirov wrote on May 9, 1943. Incredible, isn't it? But he discovered ever fresh proof corroborating this almost until the end of the war. He made the following note on August 30, 1944, when the Soviet troops were already pressing towards Germany's borders: "Mao Tse-tung thinks that the USSR has been weakened by the war. In keeping with this biased opinion he does nothing to invigorate the policy of protecting the interests of the USSR, but reorientates himself on the United States. One gets the impression that it would have been in his interests if we had actually grown weaker."

What's the reason behind all this? Why did Mao and his group harbour and why do they continue to harbour such hatred for the Soviet Union, a country without whose aid the Chinese communists would have never risen to power nor would they have been able to retain it?

Perhaps the Chinese people have had and still have certain national interests which separate them from the USSR?



There are no such interests. The fact of the matter is that from the very beginning the Maoists were motivated not by the struggle for communism, but by a plan for creating a new super-power in Asia which would absorb some of the newly independent states on that continent and seek to attain the expansionist aims of the old Chinese emperors.

The Maoists knew that they could not count on Soviet support for such a policy that was fully divorced from the interests of communism. Hence their anti-Sovietism. They took as much as they could from the USSR and at the same time for years on end secretly prepared to turn their backs upon it. Vladimirov should be given credit for clearly understanding all this already in those years. He arrived at the following conclusion:

"Historical deception and fraud, such are Mao Tse-tung's methods of seizing power. . . . In the name of socialism Mao betrays socialism, in the name of the Communist Party he destroys the Communist Party, in the name of democracy, he institutes terror."

Very few authors of political memoirs had been taxed by such bitter experience as Vladimirov. His mission in Yenan proved to be one of the most arduous ever assigned to any other person. It is easier to fulfil a most dangerous mission behind enemy lines, than to witness the beginning of a terrible betrayal by a purported friend and be unable actively to thwart it.

How difficult it was for him is borne out by an entry made on December 12, 1944: "I sleep badly. Fitfully and restlessly. If I could only get rid of this tension for just one day. Just one day and no more."

But there were no such days. That is how people develop self-restraint.

One should not only read but also ponder such documents as Vladimirov's diary. They help the reader to understand what cannot be immediately understood from newspaper and radio reports, namely the present-day reality of East Asia.

Maoism is still on the historical scene. It is gathering strength, hatching adventuristic plans, drawing closer to

international reaction and impatiently waiting for complications on the world scene. It continues to dream of a third world war.

Sooner or later however it will collapse. And it may well be that the present generation will see this happen.

*1974*

## 14. WHAT WAS TRETTNER DOING IN PEKING?

Political, class antagonism is perhaps even more intense than personal hostility. And when people who sustained a terrible historical defeat and are now approaching the end of their lives are obsessed with this feeling, they become twice as dangerous to society. This fact is confirmed again and again.

### A Great Welcome

Should the idea of a secret military agreement between the West German revanchists and the Chinese Maoists be taken seriously?

Is it just another canard or is it something conceivable and realistic?

No, there is no reason to regard it as such. There are people both in Bonn and Peking who attach importance to such an agreement and believe that it brooks no delay. Moreover, such plans are no longer kept in secret.

Several weeks ago the capital of the PRC was the scene of a solemn welcome. Peking leaders played host to a group of prominent retired West German generals: former commander of the Bundeswehr Heinz Trettner, former Chief of Staff of Allied Air Force Command for Central Europe Johannes Steinhoff, former commander of NATO Armed Forces in Central Europe von Kielmansegg and

former chief of NATO intelligence and communications Rear-Admiral Günter Poser. Three of them were accompanied by Chairman of the Bundestag Defence Committee Right-wing deputy Manfred Wörner. The latter's presence made it clear that the retired Wehrmacht generals were still rather important figures and that they went to Peking for a definite purpose.

The guests were received among others by high-ranking officers of the Chinese General Staff. It also came to light that Trettner, Kielmansegg, Poser and Wörner travelled from Peking to Inner Mongolia, an autonomous region in China bordering on the Mongolian People's Republic, while Steinhoff visited Sinkiang, an autonomous region bordering on the Soviet Central Asian republics.

This is also an interesting fact since until then practically no foreigners had been permitted to go to Sinkiang. It was a closed region, the site of the Chinese atomic centre. Even the FRG Military Attaché in the PRC was not allowed to accompany Steinhoff who stayed in Sinkiang for several weeks and not merely a day or two.

Why did these retired West German generals visit China? Who are they?

We should say a few words about them. Though all of them should actually have a niche in the gallery of political corpses, it is evidently still too early to relegate them to oblivion.

## Goering's Favourite

Who is Trettner?

He is a man who has devoted his life above all to the art of destroying peaceful cities.

In April 1937, Trettner, who was 29 then and an officer of the Luftwaffe Kondor Legion, took part in an air-raid on the defenceless Spanish town of Guernica which lasted many hours and in which 1,654 people were killed and 889 wounded. The raid was Goering's first experiment of its kind, and became a model for similar operations in the future.



Goering promptly evaluated Trettner's singular talent, and the following year appointed him Chief of Staff of the 7th Division of the Luftwaffe, a picked detachment of nazi parachute troopers, and instructed him to draw up plans for air strikes against the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Britain, Crete, Malta, Poland and the USSR.

Few people had Trettner's talent for organising the mass annihilation of defenceless people at such short notice. It was in his nature and Hitler decorated him with the highest nazi award–the Knight's Cross with Oak Leaves.

Trettner on his part deified Hitler. And when the nazi Reich collapsed, Trettner did not retire. He went along with those nazis who thought that not everything had been lost and that the main thing was to wait until the time was ripe for revenge.

He began by speedily transforming himself into a businessman and got a job at a West German concern. After that the road was open before him. A few years later he was serving with the Bundeswehr HQ. In 1956 he was given an important post in NATO, and in 1964 Adenauer put him in command of the Bundeswehr. Goering's favourite was once again at the top.

Henceforth he concentrated wholly on taking revenge for nazi Germany's defeat. The chief of the West German intelligence Jon, who went over to the GDR, said back in 1954: "Trettner is still active behind the scenes of the soldiers' unions (reactionary associations of former officers and soldiers of the Wehrmacht in the FRG–*E.H.*) and is one of those officers who have never concealed that they are still the same confirmed fanatic followers of their führer."

In the 1960s another report found its way into the press. It said that Trettner had worked out a new major strategic plan: the dispositions of a blitz attack which would take the GDR and Czechoslovakia by surprise. Trettner himself declared in 1965 at a meeting of officers of the General Staff: "We have ample opportunities. As regards our demands, I have met with great understanding

in the Pentagon. The equipment of our army with atomic weapons can no longer be postponed."

Shortly after Trettner had to retire due to old age. He holds no official post, but remaining behind the scenes he still intends to have his revenge. So long as Hitler's and Goering's favourites are alive they have no other thought in mind but revenge. This should not be forgotten.

## "Hitler Was Too Weak"

Trettner's old friends and associates Kielmansegg and Steinhoff differ but little from him as regards their service records and mode of thinking. Unlike some people in the West I do not regard fascism as a "psychopathological" phenomenon, for obviously it is a social phenomenon. I am sure that a person who had once become a fanatical nazi will remain a frenzied political paranoic all his life. Such a man is Kielmansegg, the second of the group of retired West German generals who visited Peking.

He, too, was an officer of the General Staff of the Wehrmacht, and had a hand in the massacres of civilians in various countries including Poland and France. In a book entitled *Tanks Between Warsaw and the Atlantic Ocean*, published in 1941, he frankly wrote about the nazi plans to "strike a death blow at France" and "destroy Britain". In September 1941 Kielmansegg, who was in command of one of the hitlerite divisions which attacked Leningrad, issued an order which said: "The future of Petersburg is sealed. It is only a question of time." He was ready to burn Leningrad to the ground.

And when 25 years later Kielmansegg was appointed commander of the NATO forces in Central Europe he began to push the NATO headquarters in the same direction as Trettner, namely towards equipping the FRG with atomic weapons and preparing an attack on the GDR. Replying to a press correspondent in October 1966 who asked him whether the "advanced lines strategy", which he had recommended against the GDR, envisaged the employment of atomic weapons, he said: "This will be done as early



and with as many atomic weapons as are necessary to ensure our chances for success."

Steinhoff, the third of the "avengers", is just as bad a customer as the first two, and perhaps even surpasses them in the intensity of his nazi fury. According to him the Wehrmacht did not wage the Second World War with enough determination and it could have won it if not for the "weakness, the shortcomings and the dilettantism" of the nazi supreme command.

This is not my interpretation of Steinhoff's views but a quotation from his book *A Commodore's Diary*, which was published after this former commander of Luftwaffe Squadron No. 77 had held the posts of Chief of Staff of the Allied Aid Force for Central Europe and commander of the Bundeswehr Air Force.

Steinhoff justifies the war Hitler had unleashed as a "necessary phase in the big war against communism" and he dreams of continuing it. Hitler had personally awarded Steinhoff the highest nazi military decoration, and Franco awarded him a Spanish order. But Steinhoff regards Hitler as a dilettante.

It is clear who these people are. Trettner, Kielmansegg and Steinhoff are hereditary, diehard German militarists who in our day still harbour the ideas of Moltke, Schlieffen, Hindenburg, Ludendorff, Hoffmann and Guderian. They are unable to think along other lines and deliberately close their eyes to the contemporary world. Only one thing is new in the world as far as they are concerned, and that is new weapons while everything else should remain just as it was under Kaiser and remained under Hitler. History in their opinion should not move forward but remain standing at attention where German militarism raged in the 1940s.

Revenge, revenge for 1945, revenge whatever the cost, with help from any quarter, against any enemy. That is all there is in the programme of all these people and the military-industrial complex which stands behind them.

They want to rectify Hitler's "miscalculations" and "blunders", and above all one of his greatest "blunders",

namely that he did not procure an active, fighting ally against the USSR in the *east*, in Asia.

The subject of the negotiations which Trettner, Kielmansegg and Steinhoff had in Peking has not been disclosed. But one can be sure that the most secret topic of these talks was the keen desire of the senescent Hitlerite generals to acquire China as an ally.

It should be taken into consideration that such plans had been worked out by the nazi General Staff many years ago. Now it is simply a question of updating them.

## "The PRC Instead of Old Japan"

It would not be amiss to recall that in the period between the two world wars the German militarists for a decade or so persistently tried to gain control over the Chinese army. Their emissaries, who became Chiang Kai-shek's closest military advisers and "instructors" of his army, were regularly dispatched to China. These emissaries came and went but all of them pursued one aim, that of preparing the Chinese army for the time when the Wehrmacht would attack the Soviet Union and then use it to create a "second" anti-Soviet front in Asia.

The first German emissary who came to China back in 1927 (shortly after Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary coup) was Ludendorff's associate Colonel Max Bauer, the second was Hitler's military adviser Colonel Hermann Kriebel, and the third (from 1930) was the chief of the Reichswehr's "Truppenamt"–the secretly re-established German General Staff–General Georg Wetzell.

In 1934 General Hans von Seeckt, the founder of the Reichswehr, visited China. This fact alone attests to the significance which the German brass attached to "operation China". It was Wetzell and Seeckt who helped Chiang Kai-shek to plan the 5th campaign against the Chinese Red Army as a result of which it was forced to withdraw to the north.



Between 1934 and 1938 recommendations to the Kuomintang military leadership were given by General Alexander Falkenhausen, General Hans von Seeckt's close associate and former commander of one of Turkey's armies. Finally, in 1938 the nazi Field Marshal Reichenau arrived in China on a special mission. Chiang Kai-shek's Foreign Minister, who arrived in Berlin at the same time, said: "China regards Germany as its best friend."

All German generals who were sent to China were first-rate, picked General Staff officers of the Reichswehr and the Wehrmacht. Even the post of chief of Chiang Kai-shek's personal guard was held by the nazi Stennes, one-time leader of the Berlin storm troopers. The Chinese army was equipped with German weapons and there were plans of building up a modern war industry in China.

In other words, preparations were being made for the conclusion of a German-Chinese alliance. The Wehrmacht intended to raise under the nominal command of Chiang Kai-shek, but actually under its own supreme command, a Chinese shock army which at the critical moment in the war would be committed to action in the Soviet Far East and at the same time in Central Asia from where it would advance to link up with the German armies which were to push ahead towards the Volga and the Caucasus.

It was only Hitler's deal with Japan which followed the signing of the so-called anti-Comintern pact that compelled the German militarists on the eve of the Second World War to cut short their "Chinese experiment". The general view was that Japan's Kwantung Army would be a much more formidable ally of Germany than Chiang Kai-shek's rather unreliable troops. The Chinese dictator was left to fare for himself, but shortly he came under the patronage of the Americans. The plans for operations in Asia drawn up by Wehrmacht's strategy-makers were shelved.

Hitler made a mistake when he picked Japan as his ally, miscalculating in Asia just as he did in Europe. The German militarists took this into account. Hence there is nothing strange in the fact that Trettner and his accomplices are now re-reading the Wehrmacht's old plans.

In any case the welcome that was accorded Trettner's group in Peking proves that the PRC is meeting the revanchist generals half-way. And so Trettner begins where Falkenhausen and Reichenau had left off in 1938.

His intentions are obvious. For the sake of revenge he is prepared to form an alliance with any partner. But what actually prompts the Chinese leaders to strike a deal with him?

In effect the same motives which forty years ago prompted the counter-revolutionary Chiang Kai-shek. But now, quite obviously, other things as well.

The decisive factor drawing the ones and the others to each other is their intense hatred of detente. Pursuing their insane great-power chauvinistic plans, the Peking leaders calculate to achieve them with the help of the West. On their part the revanchists and militarists in the West stake on Peking's rabid anti-Sovietism. Birds of a feather flock together.

## New Militarism

A closer scrutiny of the policy lately pursued by the Maoist leadership immediately reveals that its main trend is the accelerated militarisation of the country and above all the urgent modernisation of the Chinese military machine. Everything is subordinated to this aim which is no longer kept in secret. At no other time in China's history has the idea of militarisation been proclaimed so loudly and blatantly as today.

Mao Tse-tung's old military theory which puts armaments into second place in a war after "popular" action is now being revised. It has been announced that China's armed forces and military equipment should be brought to the level of the highest standards within the shortest possible time and then eventually surpass them. The Chinese people will have to pay for this. But how can a country with a not-too-high level of development rapidly modernise its armed forces?



There is every indication that the nazi generals have already made concrete offers to Peking and that that was the purpose of the Trettner group's visit.

It is not merely a matter of outfitting the Chinese army with modern military equipment and, particularly, of providing China with the means for manufacturing nuclear missiles and aircraft. Quite obviously the nazi generals are ready, just as forty years ago, to advise the Chinese armed forces on organisational and strategic matters.

For instance, it was reported that while in Peking the nazi generals gave the Chinese officers detailed information about the modern training methods employed in the Bundeswehr and the West German Luftwaffe. On their part the Maoists said that they were strongly in favour of the "principle of defence on advanced lines", that is, of the aggressive strategic conception which was once advanced precisely by Trettner and Kielmansegg. The West German guests were shown Chinese military equipment, military training methods, underground installations and gunnery practice. They were also able to familiarise themselves with the "strategic course" and "defence capability" of the PRC.

All this confirms that the generals had offered to furnish the present Chinese militarists with the experience of the Wehrmacht and the armed forces that have replaced it, and that their proposal was accepted.

Whether they offered to do this with no strings attached is another question. In any case the military industrial complex across the Elbe will experience no lack of military orders. The same can be said about the agreement between West German military and monopoly circles and the South African racialists on the construction of an atomic complex in South Africa. As we have already said, Trettner has close ties with major military concerns in the FRG. They are acting in tandem in the FRG.

It is not a secret that West German experts helped the Maoists organise the manufacture of missiles back in the 1960s. Now, however, it is a matter of fostering much broader co-operation. This is borne out by Steinhoff's trip to Sinkiang and the visit to Inner Mongolia by Trettner,

Kielmansegg, Poser and Wörner. At the same time West Germany continues its deliveries of important equipment for atomic and missile installations to China.

It is a tangle of strategy, economics and diplomacy.

## Overflowing Adventurism

Influential West German political circles are also secretly involved in all these deals. This is obvious.

For many years already revanchist leader Strauss, a man with excessive ambitions, has been pushing the Right-wing CDU and CSU parties onto the road of striking a deal with the Maoists whom he himself had visited. There is every reason to say that this is one of his main foreign policy cards. He intends not only to thwart detente, but in the long run to create the threat of aggression to the socialist countries of Europe both from the West and the East.

Incidentally, this "strategic conception" is now a favourite with the neofascists in various countries. For a long time already they have been placing much greater hopes on the PRC than Hitler had once placed on Japan.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the revanchists and neofascists in Europe place their stakes on Maoist China alone. They place them on all those who are prepared to go along with them and revive the cold war, thwart detente and prepare aggression against the socialist countries. Their trump-cards for the time being are the Pentagon and NATO, those bulwarks of imperialist operations in Europe proper. But in the matter of building up a "second anti-Soviet front" they regard Maoist China as an indispensable ally.

So far no one knows whether any definite conditions of the deal had been worked out during the visit to Peking by Trettner and his friends. In such cases secret negotiations do not necessarily continue in the capitals of the countries concerned. Yet history has a habit of revealing the most close-locked secrets. What the old nazis and the Maoists have agreed upon and what will happen in the future will come to light sooner or later.



The first steps towards their direct rapprochement have already been made. The new militarism in East Asia is linking arms with the ruins of the old militarism in Europe. Both have their own interests, plans and ulterior motives, but one and the same object of hatred. "Ideology" has nothing to do with it. It is also evident that as the spirit of detente in Europe and in Soviet-American relations strengthens, the heavier will the revanchists stake on Peking's anti-Sovietism.

At all times political gamblers attempted to outwit history. Our entire century has been witness to their efforts. But it has also been witness to their inglorious results.

No one, whoever he is and wherever he may be, can get the better of the objective reality of the contemporary world. The principles of peaceful coexistence, as the only sensible ones, are growing stronger in international affairs. The calculations of the adventurers will prove to be miscalculations. Nothing else can come of their game.

## Against National Interests

General Trettner is 70 now, Kielmansegg is 71 and Steinhoff is 64. The time when they could interfere into European history with impunity has passed, and life has left them on the sidelines. For that alone they will continue to press for revenge.

Well, it is useless to argue with people who persist in living in the past. But when these political corpses try to act in the present to the detriment of the living, that is another matter. Those who stand in the way of detente, strike deals with the enemies of peace and toy with the idea of an atomic war can expect no mercy.

And now the last question. Are there many Germans across the Elbe who are in favour of new and mad political ventures? No, there are not. There is every indication that a vast majority of the West German population is against such a policy. Trettner and his ilk know this, but they continue their dance on the brink of the prec-

ipice. They simply cannot help themselves. It is in their blood.

The deal which is being negotiated by West German revanchists and Peking militarists is a typical example of the policy of madness which the German imperialists have been pursuing for decades on end. The vital national interests of the Germans on the opposite bank of the Elbe are incompatible with this line. In their efforts to take their revenge on mankind Trettner and his accomplices are wreaking vengeance upon their own people in the first place.

*1977*

## 15. IN LIEU OF AN EPILOGUE

This book spans a period of ten years, from 1967 to 1977.

Has anything changed in the Maoists' domestic policy of late?

No. They are continuing the same frenzied policy of militarising the country whatever the cost. The population which has to pay for it is being subjected to the same merciless pressure. Chinese peasants, workers and the intelligentsia are still unable to make ends meet and continue to tighten their belts.

How long will it be possible to exhaust and bleed the Chinese economy white in order to "prepare for war" in keeping with the Maoists' appeals.

Reprisals against the adversaries of the present Peking leadership are continuing. Tens of thousands of people are being subjected to repressions and executed.

In February 1978 it was reported that more than 80 per cent of vice-chairmen of revolutionary committees in provinces and cities subject to the central authority have been removed from their posts.

How much longer will the Party and Government apparatus be able to stand up to such pressure–and this has been going on for more than 25 years already!

Has anything changed in the foreign policy of the Maoists? There is not even a hint of change. Eruptions of unfounded hatred for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are continuing. We are witnessing the same,

or rather more intense, flirtations with the imperialist powers, with NATO and with Right-wing parties in various capitalist countries.

The West is openly jubilant about all this. In January 1978 Reuters reported that NATO would welcome any growth in the defensive capacity (militarisation–*E.H.*) of China. Does this mean that a direct, though secret, military alliance between NATO and Peking is in the offing?

Finally, there is systematic incitement of street passions in the Western countries with the view to provoke and discredit the real Left-wing working-class movement. All this is done by the Maoists under a leftist mask and is synchronised with similar actions by fascists and semi-fascists. It can be called a stab in the back.

What does all this amount to? To incessant wanderings in a political labyrinth. One gets the impression that Maoism is chasing after its own shadow, but cannot find a way out.

Yet the PRC has always had a way out. Only a return to the family of socialist nations will open a broad road to the future for the Chinese people.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.